

AN

ANSWER

To a BOOK Intituled

*A plain Account of the Nature and  
End of the*

SACRAMENT

OF THE

LORD'S SUPPER.

In a Letter to the AUTHOR.

PART I.

By RICHARD WARREN D. D. Rector of CAVEN-  
DISH in SUFFOLK, and late Fellow of JESUS College  
in CAMBRIDGE.



CAMBRIDGE

Printed for W. THURLBURN.

And Sold by Messrs. Innes and Manby, S. Birt, Charles  
Rivington, and F. Clay Bookfellers in London.

M, DCC, XXXVI.







SIR

SINCE You have not thought fit to set your Name to your late Treatise upon the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, it is presum'd, that you desire it should be conceal'd, and as you may have very good Reasons for its being so, I shall not use any Endeavours to disappoint you, but shall treat you as the Author of this Performance, abstractedly from all other Considerations whatsoever. If therefore I shall not observe so much Ceremony and Distinction towards you, as your own Personal Qualities, or your Place and Station in the World may demand, you will not blame me for not doing what you have taken so much prudent Care to prevent. I shall therefore without Scruple tell you that your Book is look'd upon by all Persons I have convers'd with upon the

A

Subject,

Subject, as containing a Scheme directly opposite to the plain Doctrine of Scripture, to the Sense and Opinion of the ancient Fathers, and to the exprefs Decisions of our own Church. That the Manner of your treating the Subject, together with the Forms of Prayer subjoin'd, hath a direct Tendency to corrupt the Purity of the Christian Faith, and to destroy the Dignity and Importance of the Christian Ordinances. And since this is my own Judgment upon the Matter, as well as the Judgment of Others, I shall not think it needful to make any Apology for using my best Endeavours for preventing the Influence of a Performance, so derogatory to the Honour of our *Blessed Saviour*, and the Power and Efficacy of his *Institutions*. The Honesty of my Intention, and the Importance of the Subject, will justify my Endeavours, and I humbly hope, with God's Blessing, they will be useful to plain and serious Christians, for preventing their being corrupted in their Sentiments of *Christianity*, and led into mean and unworthy Thoughts of the *Nature* and *Office* of the Lord who *bought them*, of that Pardon and *Satisfaction* He has wrought

wrought for them, and of those *Ordinances* He has instituted as the Rites of Worship, and the Means of obtaining his Favour. I proceed therefore to my Design, which is to examine all the Parts of your Performance, as well what concerns the Doctrine of the Lord's Supper, as those Forms of Prayer publish'd, as you say, *for the use of well dispos'd Christians\**, but which are, as I verily think, so defective in *some* Points, and so affrontive to *Almighty God* in *others*, so flat, quaint, and affected in the Manner of Expression, so *studiously* void of Scripture-Phrase and Sentiments, and so foreign to the chief End and Design of all Prayer, as to be utterly unfit to be used by any Christian whatsoever. I shall begin with your Title-Page, not with any Design of differing from you in every Thing, but because, I think, you have made Choice of a Title, that does by no Means suit your Performance, and which tends to lead Men into an Expectation which you have by no Means answer'd. For whereas you call it *An Account of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, it is notorious, your main Inten-

\* Pag. 200.

tion is to shew, that there is no *Sacrament* in it at all, according to the known Meaning of the Word, as it is settled by Divines Ancient and Modern, and as it is expressly defin'd by our Church in her *Catechism* and *Articles*. For whereas it is declar'd in the *Catechism*, that a *Sacrament* is an outward and visible Sign of an inward and Spiritual Grace given unto us, and that the outward Sign is not only the Means of our receiving the Spiritual Grace, but is also a Pledge to assure us thereof; and whereas the Church has determin'd in her 25th Article That *Sacraments* ordain'd of Christ, be not only Badges or Tokens of Christian Mens Profession, but rather they be certain sure Witnesses and effectual Signs of Grace, and God's Will towards us, by the which He doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in Him. Now directly contrary to this, it is the only Purpose of your Book, to shew that the partaking of the Symbols of Bread and Wine in the Lord's Supper is no more than a Badge and Token of the Christian Profession, and tho' it is to be done in an Honourable Remembrance of Christ, it amounts to no more than an Acknow-



Acknowledgment of Him for our Master, is no particular Means of Divine Grace and Spiritual Strength, conveys no extraordinary beneficial Influences to the worthy Receivers, is indeed little more than an Act of *Civility* and *Complaisance* to our Lord and Master, and may therefore be suitably perform'd without *Solemnity* or *Preparation*, is however attended with *no Grace*, by which *God works invisibly in us\**, nor indeed with any *Impressions* or Influences whatsoever, but that the Expectation of such Impressions is vain and groundless, and that the Nature of them is little different from that of *Charms*. Now this is so inconsistent with the Supposition of the Lord's Supper's being a *Sacrament*, that it is astonishing how you cou'd fix upon a Title that must lead your Reader into an Expectation of your treating it as such, when it would have been so much more agreeable to the Purpose of your Book to have intitled it, A Discourse to shew, That the *Lord's Supper* is not only *improperly* but *falsly* call'd A SACRAMENT: But this tho' it wou'd have been an open and fair Way of Dealing, wou'd not have

been quite so artful as the Method you have taken. For many serious and well-meaning Christians might have been frighten'd from looking into a Book that profess'd in its very Title to explode the *Catechism* and *Articles*. They were fram'd by Men of so great Piety and Learning, have been explain'd, defended, *Subscrib'd* to by so many able Hands, that they are justly receiv'd by the generality with great *Reverence*: so that you wou'd have been apt to have led your Reader into some Suspensions concerning you, if you had appriz'd Him of your Design at first. Indeed after the Design of your *Title* was serv'd, at the End of your Book, in an *Appendix*, you declare frankly enough, that *the Word Sacrament is the lowest for Authority, and the latest for Date, of any other that has been used to express this Rite by, and that the New Testament knows nothing of it, and cannot lead any Christians into the Notion of it, as apply'd to the Lord's Supper\**. But surely this being your Judgment, it wou'd have been more suitable to an honest Design of instructing well-meaning Christians in the Nature of this Rite,

\* Pag. 188.

not to have call'd it by a Name, that according to the known and settled Meaning of it, gives Grounds to expect those *Benefits* from the use of it, which it is the main Design of your Treatise to shew, are not to be found in it. But you wou'd seem to get clear of this Charge, by attempting to shew, that, after all, the Sense of this Word, even as explain'd by the Church in the beforemention'd Definition, is consistent with that Notion of the Lord's Supper which you maintain throughout your Book. What you have done upon this Occasion, is a new and full Proof to me, of what I have sometimes observ'd of a certain Sort of Men, that there are no Words so plain, no Decisions so clear and express, but they can, by one subtil Distinction or other find Means to evade them. A plain Man that is not well practic'd in this *Art*, wou'd be apt to think that our Church in the Words of the Definition of a *Sacrament*, must be understood to mean that in the Lord's Supper, there are two Things receiv'd, one *outward* and *visible*, and the other *inward* and *Spiritual*. Whereas, according to your refin'd Way of explaining the Definition,

the

the *Bread* and *Wine* are only *visible Signs* of a *Grace* or *Mercy* of *God* in *general* conferr'd upon *Mankind* by the *Death* of his *Son*, without any *Application* of *that Mercy* to *particular Persons* thro' the *Use* of those *Signs* \*. One wou'd be apt to think also that the *Church* meant to teach, because She so exprefsly says it, that the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper* was *ordin'd* by *Christ*, as a *Means* whereby we receive his *Spiritual Grace*; whereas after all, she means only (what it wou'd have been wonderfully easy for Her to have said if She had meant it) that it was a *Mark* and *Memorial* of the same. Who wou'd think too, that when She calls the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper* a *Pledge* to assure us of this *Spiritual Grace*, She did not mean it a *Pledge* in reality, but only the *Memorial* and *Token* of a *Pledge*. I acknowledge, Sir, that this *Exposition* of the *Sense* of the *Church* in these *Instances*, is a pregnant *Proof* of your great *Dexterity* at explaining away a *Writer's* *Sense* and *Meaning*, in *Spite* of his own *Words*, and repeated *Declarations*. But if *Constructions* so forc'd and arbitrary are to

\* Pag. 190.

be receiv'd as an Author's true Sense and Meaning, there is an End at once of all certainty in Language, and it will be in vain to seek for any one's Sense in his own Explication of it. I leave it to those whom it concerns to consider, whether such Methods have not a Tendency towards the defeating all the Benefits intended by *Oaths*, *Subscriptions*, and *Declarations*; and whether if the same Arts were to be used in making a Comment upon our Statute-Book, it might not destroy that Security which we justly hope for from the Clearness and Perspicuity of the Laws. But your Attempt herein is the more flagrant, because if there had been any Ambiguity in the Definition it self, what afterwards follows in the *Catechism* has cut off all possible Handle for mistaking its Meaning. For when the Terms of the general Definition are afterwards explain'd by an Application to *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, it is said of one, The Grace conferr'd, is *a Death unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness*, and of the other, that the *Body and Bloud of Christ* are so verily and indeed taken by the Faithful, that they have their Souls strengthen'd and re-

B

fresh'd



*fresh'd thereby, even as their Bodies are by the Bread and Wine.*

YOU begin with professing it to be your *Design to give as good Instructions as you can to honest and well-dispos'd Christians, for the right Performance of the Duty of partaking of the Lord's Supper; and to lay down what you have to say, in so plain a Manner, that every Christian capable of thinking at all upon this Subject, may be able immediately to see, whether it conveys to Him the true Notions of this Duty or not* \*. This must be own'd to be a fair Profession, and becoming every Writer upon a Subject of such Importance, and so general a Concernment. How you have executed this Design, will appear soon : In the mean Time I cannot but observe to you, that the Method you have taken for this *good End*, is very singular and extraordinary, forasmuch as you never fail, in your Explanation of any Texts of Scripture to give your own Sense of the Passage, and then to argue from it as the *true one*, how arbitrary soever it may really be, and however contrary not only to receiv'd O-

\* Pag. 1. and 2.

pinions, but to the plain Sense and Purport of the *Passage* it self. This is certainly a very *unfair* Method of proceeding, and serves to *blind* and *deceive* your Readers, rather than to instruct them, and make them Judges of the Points in debate; Because it is plainly calculated, to win them over to your Sentiments, without letting them know, what has, and justly may be objected to them. An *Impartial Writer* will not lay on *Colours* to disguise or cover any Part of the *Passage* under Consideration, but will open the whole, and propose it under all the Views, in which it may be taken, and will clear the Way to the giving his own Sense, by removing Objections, and *proving* every Point concerning which any Question may arise. But this is not your Way: On the contrary, 'tis usual with you, to take many Particulars for granted, which are not only disputable, but may also be prov'd to be false, and yet to build upon them as upon Points evident and certain. I mention this to warn you against being too confident upon the suppos'd Merit of your *Performance*. If I do not shew this to be the Case in nume-

rous Instances, I must take Shame to my self for the Boldness of the Charge against you; If I do, I shall not need any Apology for making it. You have drawn out your *Scheme* into Eighteen Propositions, and the rest of your Work consists in illustrating and supporting them. I must therefore examine *them* in their Order, together with what you have advanc'd in Proof of them. Your four first Propositions are these.

I. THE *partaking of the Lord's Supper is not a Duty of it self, or a Duty apparent to us from the Nature of Things, but a Duty made such to Christians, by the Positive Institution of JESUS CHRIST.*

II. ALL POSITIVE DUTIES or Duties made such by Institution alone, depend intirely upon the Will and Declaration of the Person who institutes and ordains them, with respect to the real DESIGN and END of them, and consequently to the due MANNER of performing them.

III. It is plain therefore, that the NATURE, the DESIGN, and the due MANNER of  
par.

*partaking of the LORD'S SUPPER, must of Necessity depend upon what JESUS CHRIST, who instituted it, hath declared about it.*

IV. *It cannot be doubted that He himself sufficiently declar'd, to his first and immediate Followers, the whole of what He design'd should be understood by it, or imply'd in it.*

THESE Propositions are true, and I shall not contradict them; but I think they receive no great Improvement or Illustration from what you have added concerning them. However I must observe to you that by *Manner of performing a Positive Duty*, mention'd Prop. 2. and by *Manner of partaking of the Lord's Supper*, mention'd Prop. 3, which you say *depends intirely upon the Declaration of the Institutor*, I understand you to mean only the *Manner* of performing the Duty with Regard to all the Parts of the Sacred Action it self, such as the *breaking and eating Bread, and drinking Wine, in Remembrance of Christ*, and not with Regard to the Temper and Sentiments and Dispositions of those who partake

take of the *Lord's Supper*. For as to this *inward Manner* of performing the Duty, it may not be necessary to suppose it to have been particularly describ'd by the Institutor, but may be left in this Case as it certainly is in many others to be gather'd and infer'd from the Nature of the Duty it self. And with this Restriction I admit your four first Propositions for true. Your fifth Proposition is brought by you as an Inference from the foregoing, and it is this.

V. *IT is of small Importance, therefore to CHRISTIANS, to know what the many Writers upon this Subject, since the Time of the EVANGELISTS and APOSTLES have affirm'd. Much less can it be the Duty of Christians to be guided by what any Persons by their own Authority, or from their own Imaginations, may teach concerning this Duty.*

Now before I examine this Inference I will take leave to observe that it wou'd more properly, and naturally have been made, after the mention of the sixth Proposition, and that as it lies, it interrupts the thread  
of



of your Reasoning, for which Cause, I shall here recite your sixth Proposition, and then proceed.

VI. *THE Passages in the New Testament which relate to this Duty, and they alone, are the original Accounts of the Nature and End of this Institution; and the only Authentic Declarations, upon which we of later Ages can safely depend: being written by the immediate Followers of our Lord; Those who were Witnesses themselves to the INSTITUTION, or were instructed in it, either by those who were so, or by Christ himself; and consent in delivering down one and the same Account of this Religious Duty.*

I AM ready to allow the Truth of this Proposition too, and I think it plain enough, without what you add as a Comment upon it; it being indeed allow'd on all hands, that we must seek for the Mind of *God our Saviour* concerning his Institutions, in those Parts of Holy Scripture that treat about them, and that He has certainly therein declar'd every Thing necessary for us to know  
and

and do in order to our secure performing them according to his Will. But notwithstanding this, it is also not to be deny'd, that contentious Men are often wont to make Difficulties, where there really are none, and by their *perverse Disputings* to perplex Matters, in themselves sufficiently plain, only to serve some darling Lust, or favorite Opinion, whereby it happens that in short Descriptions of a Rite or Duty, Contentions may arise about the Meaning of them, and a Dust may be raised sufficient to render the discernment of the Truth obscure and dubious. Now in this Case, surely an Appeal to the Opinion and Practice of those who convers'd with the Writers of the Holy Scriptures, or their immediate Disciples, and Followers, is highly just and reasonable, in order to the fixing the Sense of any particular Passages, concerning which Questions have been mov'd. For in a Matter of Universal Concernment, (as the Point in hand is allow'd to be) it is greatly absurd to imagine, that they who were so *serious* in their Professions of Faith in Christ and his Religion, as to die *Martyrs* for the Truth of it, wou'd falsify and misreport, what

what they had heard and believ'd to be the Sense and Practice of our Saviour and his Apostles, with Regard to any *Article of Faith* or any *Religious Rite* and *Ceremony* whatsoever. After the Passages of Scripture then are examin'd, concerning this Holy Institution, if there shou'd be any Difference of Opinion about the Meaning of our Saviour herein, it must be always safe and commendable for Men to confirm the Sense they have of it, by shewing the Agreement it has with the express and repeated Declarations of Persons of undoubted Credit and Authority, who came next after the Apostles. Because indeed their united Suffrage with Regard to the Meaning of any Passage of Scripture, which directs the Performance of the publick Offices of the Church, or declares the Benefits and Advantages arising from the due Performance of them, seems to be founded upon so solid a Ground of Truth and Certainty, as wou'd give any *modest* Person sufficient Reason to question any Interpretation tho' otherwise probable, if the concurrent Voice of all Antiquity gave Testimony against it. Here then you and I begin widely to differ.

C

For

For directly contrary to what is here advanc'd, you infer in your fifth Proposition, in this Manner. *It is of small Importance therefore to Christians, to know what the many Writers upon this Subject since the Time of the Evangelists and Apostles have affirm'd.* How this is a Consequence from what you before laid down of our Saviour's having sufficiently declar'd to his *immediate Followers* his whole Design concerning the *Nature and End* of the *Lord's Supper*, I cannot discern. For altho' He may have sufficiently reveal'd his Mind to the *Apostles* concerning this Point, and the same may be plainly enough declar'd in the Holy Scriptures, yet so long as there are Persons of *perverse Minds*, who will be ever *disputing* against the *plainest*, and most receiv'd Interpretations of Scripture, it may be *of the greatest Importance to Christians to know* what the Writers who follow'd next after the *Apostles*, have affirm'd concerning this Matter; not to support any Additions to what our *Saviour* and his *Apostles* have declar'd, nor to make the Inventions of Men any Part of our Lord's Institution, (which you *meanly* and without Grounds insinuate to have been the

the Case)\* but to settle and ascertain such Interpretations of Scripture, as were before very natural and probable, and to clear Mens Minds from such Doubts concerning them, as the subtil Arts of *disputations Men* may have occasion'd.

It is evident therefore, that what you have laid down in your *5th Proposition*, as a Consequence from the foregoing, does in no wise follow from them.

AND of this you seem your self suspicious, by your not daring to trust the Matter upon that Bottom. For you presently subjoin two Reasons for the Proof and Establishment of what you before laid down as true in Consequence of the foregoing Propositions. The Reasons you give are these. *Because in the Matter of an instituted Duty, no one can be a Judge but the Institutor Himself of what He design'd shou'd be contain'd in it; and because supposing Him not to have spoken his Mind plainly about it, it is impossible that any other Person (to whom*



*the Institutor Himself never reveal'd his Design) shou'd make up that Defect\*.*

Now altho' it is undoubtedly true, that in a Matter of arbitrary Institution, the Person instituting is the only Judge of his own Meaning, and altho' it will from thence follow, that if He has not plainly made known his Mind concerning what He has instituted, 'twill be impossible for any one else to supply that Defect; yet what is this to the Purpose of shewing the Primitive Writers of the Church to be improper Witnesses of the true Design of the *Apostles*, in the Declarations made by them, concerning this Rite, and the *Nature, Use and Benefits* thereof? How does this shew that their nearness to the Times of the *Apostles* did not give them an Opportunity of knowing with Certainty the Usage and Practice of the *Apostles* in solemnizing this Rite, whereby *their* Sense of the *End* and *Benefits* of partaking of it might have been known? There is therefore no Manner of Force in your Reasons for the Defense of your fifth *Proposition*, unless what you *contumeliously* sup-

\* Pag. 8.

pose, be indeed allow'd to be true, that the Antients give their Judgment in the Point before us, in Contradiction to the express Doctrine of Scripture, and ascribe *Effects* to this *Holy Ordinance*, which were neither design'd by *our Lord* nor declar'd by his *Apostles*.

BUT what is this but taking for granted, the very Point in Question? It is well known to have been the Sense of the Compilers of our *Liturgy* and of the generality of Writers upon this Subject, that there are divers eminent *Benefits* obtain'd from the Participation of the *Lord's Supper*, and that there is a special *Preparation* requir'd for that Purpose, a Neglect of which subjects Men to the Displeasure of God.

THERE are some few others, professing themselves *the Disciples of Christ*, among which I reckon you one, who pretend to find nothing promised to the Performance of this Duty, either of present or future *Benefit*, and that no other *Preparation* is requir'd but a present Attention to the Design of the Institution, so as to do it in a  
Reli-

Religious *Remembrance* of Christ, but with no Hazard to the Receivers altho' they approach the *Holy Table*, without either Amendment or indeed *Repentance*. Now upon so wide a Difference in the Sentiments of Men concerning the Design and Effects of this Duty, where both alike alledge the same Holy Scriptures in support of their opposite Opinions, what can a plain honest Christian do in the Case, but after due Examination of the Pretences and Allegations on both Sides, inquire what the first Writers of the *Christian Church* have declar'd upon the Point, and embrace that for the real Sense of Scripture, which is vouch'd for by the united Suffrage of all those Writers who from their Proximity to the Times of the *Apostles* may be justly thought capable of best knowing the true Sense of *their* Declarations concerning this Matter. And I believe the Reader will from this plain State of the Case, think that the Difficulties upon this Question, (if there really are any) cannot certainly be determin'd any other Way, than by an Appeal to those very Writers whom you have so dogmatically rejected. And I cannot but observe,

that,

that, as such a peremptory *Challenging* of Witnesses is a plain Confession that you dare not trust your Cause upon their Testimony, so also that it is a great Abatement to the Credit of your Cause. For who wou'd not be cautious how he confided in the Judgment of Men of the greatest Name, who have such an overweening Opinion of their own *Natural Abilities*, as to think themselves able upon the Strength of their own *Conceits* to overturn the Authority of the whole Church of *Christ*, and the united Judgment of the wisest and the best Men that have written since the Days of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*.

FROM all which it is evident, that altho' what is advanc'd in your *sixth Proposition* is undoubtedly true, that *the Passages in the New Testament which relate to this Duty, and they alone are the ORIGINAL Accounts of the Nature and End of this Institution*; yet that the *Ecclesiastical Writers* of earliest Antiquity are of great Weight and Significance in this Matter, not to *teach* any Thing the *Apostles* have not taught us concerning the Design and Use of this Ordinance,  
but

but to *fix* and *ascertain* the true Sense and Design of *those Passages of Scripture* which the captious Subtilties of *perverse* Men have render'd in any Degree dubious or obscure.

I DO not hereby mean to grant that there is really any Difficulty in finding out the true Sense of what the Scripture has taught us concerning this Duty. I only contend, that since there is a Difference in Opinion among learned Men concerning the Meaning of those Passages that relate to it, *that Sense* must have the justest Pretensions for Acceptance, which is supported by the Judgment of those who had many Opportunities of knowing what was the true one which we must now all want.

I AM come to your *seventh Proposition* to which I perfectly agree, and it is this.

VII. THE *Writers of the NEW TESTAMENT* give an Account of the Institution of the LORD'S SUPPER, in the following PASSAGES, which therefore are principally to be regarded. viz. St. Matthew Chap. 26. v. 26, &c. St. Mark Ch.



St. Luke Ch. 22. v. 19, &c. And St. Paul, 1 Cor. Ch. 11. v. 23, &c.

St. Math. 26. 26. And as they were eating, Jesus took Bread, and blessed IT, and brake IT, and gave IT to the Disciples, and said, take, eat; This is my Body.

27. And He took the Cup, and gave Thanks and gave IT to them, saying, drink ye all of it.

28. For this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the Remission of Sins.

St. Mark 14. 22. And as they did eat, Jesus took Bread, and blessed, and brake IT, and gave to them, and said, take, eat; This is my Body.

23. And He took the Cup, and when He had given Thanks, He gave IT to them: And they all drank of it.

24. And He said unto them, This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many.

St. Luke 22. 19. And He took Bread, and gave Thanks, and brake IT, and gave unto them, saying, This is my Body, which is given for you: This do in remembrance of me.

20. Likewise also the Cup after Supper, saying, this Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you.

St. Paul 1 Cor. 11. 23. For I have receiv'd of the Lord that which also I deliver'd unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same Night, in which He was betrayed, took Bread:

24. And when He had given Thanks, He brake it, and said, take, eat, This is my Body, which is broken for you: This do in Remembrance of me.

25. After the same Manner also, He took the Cup, when He had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink IT, in Remembrance of me.

To these Words of the Institution the Apostle adds.

26. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till He come.

You begin your Remarks upon the Expressions made use of in these Passages with an Imputation upon our English Translators of the Holy Bible, by saying there is nothing

in the *Original* that requires the adding the Word *IT* after the Word *BLESSED* as they have done in their Translation of the *Passage* in *St. Matthew*. And you then observe that this Addition *has perhaps been the Occasion of some groundless Notions*, which however you do not charge as design'd by the Translators, forasmuch as they, you say, themselves thought they had *little Reason* for adding the Word *IT* after *BLESSED* in *St. Matthew*, which you gather from *their not having added it to St. Mark 14. 22. Tho' the very same Greek Word is used by Him.*

WHETHER what the Translators have added does truly express the Meaning of the Original, or no, shall be examin'd presently. You have not told us what those Notions are you call *groundless*. But, I think, we cannot wrong you in supposing one to be the old Notion of a true and proper *Benediction* or *Consecration* of the Elements in the *Lord's Supper*, because *that Notion* seems to be so plainly countenanc'd by the Manner in which the Passage in *St. Matthew* is translated, and because you have sufficiently shewn in divers Parts of your Performance

that you look upon that Notion as *groundless* \*. Whether it is really so or no, shall be presently submitted to the Reader. In the mean Time I complain, on the Part of the Translators, of a great Injury that you have done them. For, in order to shew that they did not entertain the Notion of a proper *Consecration* in the Eucharist, you charge them with adding the Word *IT* without Design or Meaning, whereas what you alledge is intirely short of any Degree of Proof of the Matter laid against them. For altho' they have not added the Word *IT* so often in *St. Mark*, as they have in *St. Matthew*, and have omitted it after the Word *BLESSED*, yet they have added it in such Manner, as makes the Sense given by them of the Words of *St. Mark* perfectly the same with their Translation of the Passage in *St. Matthew*. Indeed, if they had not inserted the Word *IT* in *St. Matthew* after the Word *BLESSED*, we might have question'd, whether they meant in either Passage, to have had it understood to be their Notion, that the Bread was *BLESSED* by *our Lord*. But since they have so distinctly given their O-

pinion of the Matter, by adding the Word IT after BLESSED in St. *Matthew*, and have also added the same Word in St. *Mark*, in such a Manner, as makes, (by a reasonable Construction) the Sense of both Passages perfectly the same, you have really offer'd them a *double Injury*, First by endeavouring to defraud them of the Credit of a Notion they plainly *had*, and then to do it by charging them with a Fault they certainly *had not*. Your Conduct herein seems the less justifiable, because one may espy a low *Artifice* in it. This Insinuation was thrown out to lead the *English Reader* into a Belief that the Translators of the Holy Bible, for whose Judgment they have justly the greatest Reverence, had as little Notion of the Necessity of *Blessing* the Holy Elements as you profess to have\*.

It is easy however from hence to observe, that how much soever you may pretend to disclaim Authority, you wou'd be glad enough to bring *Vouchers* for your Opinions, if you could find any, other than



those, whom for certain Reasons, you care not yet to name.

YOU proceed in your Remark \*, and say, If, instead of adding the Word *IT* the Translators had added the Word *GOD*, the Meaning of the *Evangelist* would have been truly express'd, thus, *Jesus having taken Bread, and having blessed GOD, brake it &c.* And you argue that this is the one *natural* Sense of the Word [*εὐλογήσας*] in this Place, because the Word used by *St. Luke* and *St. Paul* to signify the same Action of our Lord in the Institution, being *εὐχαριστήσας*, which you say, can signify only *having given Thanks to GOD*, and the Word *εὐλογήσας* easily signifying the same, it must follow that the Word used by *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark* must signify *having Blessed God in the Sense of giving Thanks, and Praise to Him; and not having Blessed the Bread in any other Sense, but that of speaking over it Words of Praise and Thanksgiving to God.* And you endeavour to confirm this Reasoning by observing that *St. Matthew* and *St. Mark* themselves using the Word *εὐχαριστήσας* when they

\* Pag. 11, 12.

speak of the Cup, have explain'd themselves  
 and shewn that they meant no more than  
 giving Praise and Thanks, when they speak  
 of the Blessing of the Bread\*. And you  
 conclude the Remark by saying that so ma-  
 ny MSS. of good Note read this very Word  
 [εὐχαριστίας] in this Passage of St. Matthew  
 concerning the Bread, instead of [εὐλογίας]  
 that this latter Word may well be thought to  
 have been transplanted hither from St. Mark,  
 by some of the Transcribers. This is a full  
 and just Representation of your first Remark,  
 and in Answer to it I observe

I. THAT the Words of St. Matthew and  
 St. Mark when strictly render'd being these  
 [as they were eating, Jesus having taken Bread  
 and having Blessed, brake, and gave to the  
 Disciples.] It is very plain that the natural  
 and obvious Construction of them leads us  
 to suppose that the Action of Blessing must  
 terminate upon the Bread, forasmuch as  
 there is no other Object express'd to which  
 it can be referr'd. Our Saviour is here said  
 to have taken Bread, and 'tis allow'd by all  
 that what He took, He brake and gave to

\* Pag. 13.

his Disciples, so that in plain and natural Construction, what He *took* and *broke* and *gave*, He *Blessed* also. Nothing can obstruct this Sense of the Words, but either some *Incongruity* in the Thing, or some *Impropriety* in the Expression. Now what *Incongruity* there can be in our Saviour's separating Bread from its common Use, and *sanctifying* it by Prayer and Thanksgiving to a holy and spiritual Purpose, (which is the plain Meaning of Blessing it) I think is not easy to say. And that there is no *Impropriety* in the Expression, is plain from its being used in Reference to Men, and to Material Things as well as God, both in the *Septuagint* Translation and also in the *New Testament*. So particularly it is said of *Samuel* that He *doth bless the Sacrifice* \*, and of our Blessed Saviour, that He *took the five Loaves, and the two Fishes, and looking up to Heaven, He Blessed THEM* &c. †

2. I OBSERVE that this Construction is not only natural but necessary. For as

\* 1 Sam. 9. 13. Ὅτι ἔτε· εὐλογεῖ τὴν θυσίαν.

† Luke 9. 16. λαβὼν ὃ τὰς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τὰς δύο ἰχθύας, ἐβλῆκεν αὐτὰς εἰς τὸ ἕρπον, εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰς, καὶ κατέκλασε &c.

much

much as, if the Word *εὐλογήσας* does not terminate upon the *Bread* here mention'd, but is to be referr'd to *God*, in the Sense of his being the Object *bleſſed*, at the ſame Time that the Word *God* is not expreſſed, it is altogether an unprecedented Manner of ſpeaking, and is ſupported, not by ſo much as one ſingle Example, either in the *Septuagint* or the *New Teſtament*. The Word *εὐλογεῖν* is uſed, in one Form or other, not many Times leſs than 300 in the *Septuagint*, in every one of which the Object *Bleſſed* is expreſſed. And for this there is a plain Reason, becauſe the Word is uſed under a threefold Notion. Man is often ſaid to *bleſs God*, in the Sense of praizing and extolling his Excellencies. God is alſo as uſually ſaid to *bleſs Man*, in the Sense of doing Him good in every Inſtance of his Mercy towards Him, and to *bleſs inanimate Things* alſo, in the Sense of making them answer the Ends of their Creation, for the Service and Benefit of Man. And laſtly, *Man* is ſaid to *bleſs* his Fellow Creatures in the Sense of praying to God for a *Bleſſing* upon them. Now in ſuch a Variety of Senses of this Word *εὐλογεῖν*, and ſuch a

Difference of Objects to which it is apply'd, it is evidently necessary that the Object upon which the *Blessing* Terminates shou'd be alwaies named, to prevent uncertainty and mistake. And accordingly wherever the Word is used in the *New Testament* as well as the Old, this Thing is punctually observ'd; the Object to which the *Blessing* is referr'd, is perpetually express'd, unless we must except the Places in Question, and those that are parallel to them, I mean, where Mention is made of feeding the Multitude. Since therefore if the Word *εὐλογίας* is apply'd to the *Bread* in the Words of the Institution, the Construction is not only natural and easy, but the Rule is observ'd of expressing the Object *Blessed*, which is not known to be once omitted among the Hundreds of Places where the Word is to be met with in the Holy Scriptures, it seems to me as evident, that this must be the Construction, as any Conclusion can be, that is drawn from Rules and Maxims of Criticism.

3. WHAT you urge in Support of your Assertion, from a suppos'd Necessity of explaining



plaining the Word εὐλογήσας by the Word εὐχαριστήσας, is altogether without Foundation. For since one must be limited and explain'd by the other, there is a good Reason why we must take just the contrary Way, and expound the Sense of the latter by the former, which is this; because the Sense of the former, and the Manner of its Construction, is settled by the frequent and invariable Use of it in the *Septuagint*, whereas εὐχαριστῶν is a Word invented by the Writers of the *New Testament*, and so may be used by them in a Manner somewhat peculiar.

THO' indeed the Use of the Word in a transitive Construction, and in the very Sense of εὐλογεῖν, is not at all forc'd or unnatural, it is only an Imitation of the *Hebrew* short Way of writing, instead of expressing it thus, εὐχαριστήσας τῷ Θεῷ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἄρτης. However that it is so used by St. *Luke*, and St. *Paul*, is a Point settled by themselves. For St. *Luke*, when He gives an Account of the feeding five Thousand Persons, where the Action of *Blessing* is allow'd to be the same as in the Institution, that is, where the

Form of *Blessing*, whatever were the particular Words of it, must have had the same Relation to the Bread and Fishes then, as it had to the Elements in the Institution afterwards, He expressly says λαβὼν τὰς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ δύο ἰχθύας ——— εὐλόγησεν αὐτὰς. *When He had taken the five Loaves and the two Fishes ——— He blessed THEM\**. And St. Paul who must be allowed to know the Sense of his own Expression, has explain'd it in a Manner as evident as He well cou'd do, when speaking of the Cup in the *Lord's Supper* †, He emphatically calls it τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν. *The Cup of Blessing, which we BLESS*. I think this is decisive for the understanding the *Blessing* in the Institution whether express'd by the Word εὐλογεῖν or εὐχαριστεῖν in the Sense of a true and proper Consecration of the Bread and Wine to all the spiritual Purposes intended therein,

So that altho' your Supposition is not a very *modest* one, that the Word εὐχαριστησας was originally in the Text of St. *Matthew*, and that εὐλογήσας was transplanted

\* Luke 9. 16,

† 1 Cor. 10. 16.

thither by some of the Transcribers, yet if it shou'd be allow'd you, no mighty Advantage can be made of the Concession, because *St. Luke*, and *St. Paul*, who both used the Word, have fully explain'd it to the Sense of *Blessing or Consecrating* the Elements.

4. THE Truth of the Matter seems to be, that the Form of Blessing used by our Saviour, was both *Precatory* and *Eucharistical*, that it both contain'd Words of Praise, and Thanks to God for all his Gifts of *Nature and Grace*, and a Prayer also unto Him, that He would make the Bread and Wine the Means of conveying to the worthy Receivers, the Benefits of his Death and Sufferings. For the Manner of Expression being the same here, with what He used when He gave Thanks, and blessed the Barley Loaves and Fishes for the Nourishment of the Multitude, it is reasonable to suppose, that the *Form* of the *Blessing* was the same in both Cases.

Now it is plain from *St. Paul's* Epistle to *Timothy*, that the Method in use among  
the

the *Jews* of *Blessing* or *Sanctifying* their daily Food, was by a Form of *Prayer* for Nourishment from it, as well as of *Thanks* to God for the Gift of it. For what He declares at first to be good for Food, if taken with *Thanksgiving*, He in the next Verse affirms to be so, because it is sanctify'd by the Word of God and Prayer \*.

AND agreeably hercunto, *Josephus* assures us, that the Form of Blessing their Food in use among the *Jews* consisted of these two Parts *Thanksgiving* and *Prayer*. [teste *Grotio*] As it cannot therefore be thought that our Blessed Saviour used less Solemnity at the Institution of his *Supper*, than at a *Common Meal*, so it must be concluded that He *Blessed* the Elements, by a like Form. And since these different Parts of the Action of *Blessing*, are distinctly express'd by the Words *εὐχαριτεῖν*, and *εὐλογεῖν*, it is no Wonder the Sacred Writers use them both promiscuously to signify the whole Action. And forasmuch as the Effect of that Action of *Blessing*, was for the Separation of the Elements from *Common Use*, and the appoint-

\* 1 Tim. 4. 4, 5.

ing them for a *spiritual Purpose*, it was not improper, to use the Word εὐχαριστεῖν, as terminating upon the Elements in the same Manner that εὐλογεῖν is used. And that *Justin Martyr* so understood it, is most evident from his calling the Bread and Wine after Consecration ἄρτον εὐχαριστηθέντα, and οἶνον εὐχαριστηθέντα, as also τροφὴν εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν\*.

I PASS over your *Second* and *Third Remarks* without Objection, and I wish I may again find the like Occasion of agreeing with you for so many Pages together.

YOUR *Fourth Remark* is, that from what you had before observ'd, *we may be led to the true Interpretation of all the Expressions made use of, in the several Apostolical Accounts of this Institution.* You then proceed to a *Paraphrase* upon all the Words of the Institution recorded by the several *Evangelists*, and *St. Paul*. Your *Paraphrase* as it stands

\* ——— μεταλαβὴν ἀπὸ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου.

*Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 96. Edit. Thirlb.*

——— εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν. *Ibid.*

——— καὶ ἡ μετὰ λαψις ἀπὸ τῶν εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκείνων  
γίνεται *Ibid. p. 98.*

and



and as you have farther explain'd your Meaning in it by what follows, is plainly design'd to represent the Holy Ordinance of the *Lord's Supper*, a *low* and *lifeless* Ceremony, without any *peculiar* Power or Effect, for the Benefit of the Receivers, and without any other Reason or End, but to *remember Christ*, by *thus publickly acknowledging Him, for our Master*.

Now herē I must repeat my Charge against you of *unfair* Management; Forasmuch as you here take upon you to put your own Sense upon the Words of the Institution, without attempting to open and clear your Way to it, either by establishing your own Opinion, or confuting *that* which has been commonly received.

ON the contrary there are no less than three Things assum'd by you, that are so very far from being *evident*, or indeed *probable*, that, I believe, there are very few *Christians*, of whatever Denomination, who do not think them either *precarious* or *false*.

THE First is, that our Blessed Saviour when He gave his Disciples the Bread and Wine and call'd them his *Body* and *Bloud*, did it only *to introduce his Command to them*, and to shew them that they were *to take, break and eat Bread in Remembrance of his Body broken, and to drink Wine in Remembrance of his Bloud shed, for the good of them and others.*

SECONDLY, that He call'd the *Wine his Bloud of the New Covenant*, and the *New Covenant in his Bloud*, for this Reason ONLY, *because they were to drink Wine in Remembrance of his Bloud, which Bloud was to be a Seal to the Truth of the new Covenant.*

THIRDLY, that this *Remembrance of Him* is the *End and Design* of this Holy Rite.

THIS last you do not say *expressly* in your *Paraphrase*, but you intimate as much, and make it a Part of your *Eighth Proposition*, wherein you say, that it appears from these *Passages, that the End* for which our Lord *instituted this Duty was the Remembrance of Himself.*

1. FIRST, you assume for true, that our Blessed Saviour when He gave his Disciples the *Bread* and *Wine*, and call'd them his *Body* and *Bloud*, did it ONLY to introduce his Command to them, and to shew them that they were to take, break and eat *Bread* in Remembrance of his *Body* broken, and to drink *Wine* in Remembrance of his *Bloud* shed, for the good of them and others.

Now this which you take for granted, seems to me to be so far from being *self-evident*, that it wants to be clear'd of *Ab-surdity*. For is not this to suppose our Saviour to use these Words for a Reason that wou'd have been much better answer'd by not using them at all? Does He more plainly shew his Disciples what they were to do, or does He with any greater Propriety introduce his new Command of eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* in Remembrance of his *Body* and *Bloud*, by first calling them *em-phatically* his *Body* and *Bloud*? Does it not indeed serve to make the Expression uncertain in its Meaning that could not otherwise be mistaken? Eat this *Bread* and drink this *Wine* in Remembrance of me, wou'd have im-

imported the same Thing, without being subject to Ambiguity; but now that the *Bread* and *Wine* are so expressly call'd *his Body and Bloud*, nothing else can be suppos'd, but that they were so call'd to give a Dignity to the Rite, and to raise an Expectation of some extraordinary Benefit from the use of it. 'Tis true they must not be taken in their first and natural Sense, they cannot signify the *real* Body and Bloud of Christ. And one wou'd think the Impossibility of the Thing might have been a full Security against any Body's being in Danger of supposing it. However when they are taken (as they must be) figuratively, yet it will be necessary to suppose, that there is what is call'd *a likeness of Proportion*, between the Elements and the Things signify'd by them; that there is a Likeness or Analogy between the Powers and Effects of Things thus call'd by the same Names; and accordingly that the *Bread* and *Wine* do *so* become the *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ as to be by *Appointment* the true Means of conveying that Strength and spiritual Vigour to the *Souls* of the Receivers, that they are by *Nature* qualify'd to give to their *Bodies*.

WHAT confirms this Notion is, that the Disciples to whom the Words of the Institution were spoken, and who were to instruct all others in the true Sense and Meaning of them, cou'd hardly be thought capable of understanding them in any other Way. For 'tis certain, that altho' the *Jews* look'd upon the Paschal Supper but as a Memorial of the Lamb first slain in *Egypt*, upon which God promised to pass over the Houses of the Children of *Israel*, when He slew the First Born of the *Egyptians*; yet they call'd it *the Lord's Passover*, and esteem'd it not as an empty Sign, but a true and real Sacrament, a Holy and Religious Action, by which they were entitled to the Benefits and Advantages of the Covenant of God with their Forefathers. When therefore just at the End of this Paschal Supper, when this Notion was fresh and present in the Minds of the Disciples, our Saviour instituted his Supper in the Room of what they had been then partaking of, in Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Cross then immediately to be offer'd, it was extremely natural for them to think, that the Bread and Wine were call'd the Body and  
Bloud



Bloud of Christ in the same Sense as the *Paschal Supper* was call'd the *Passover*, that is, in the Sense of its being the Means of communicating the Benefits of the Sacrifice of Himself upon the Cross, to all worthy Receivers, as that was of imparting to the *Jews* the Benefit of God's Covenant with them.

SECONDLY, you assume for Truth that our Blessed Saviour call'd *the Wine his Bloud of the New Covenant, and the New Covenant in his Bloud*, for this Reason only, because *the Wine is to be drunk in Remembrance of his Bloud, which Bloud was a Seal to the Truth of the New Covenant*. So that as you afterwards explain your self, The Wine in the Sacrament is not it self a Seal or Confirmation of the Covenant, and a Conveyance of the Benefits of it to the Receivers, but a *Memorial* only of the Bloud of Christ which was the Seal of the Covenant.

Now this is all Assertion only, supported by no Reasons or Arguments, and so may be receiv'd or rejected at pleasure. But  
I shall

I shall give my Reasons, why I think your Supposition groundless.

Now I think it will not be deny'd, that what the Disciples must necessarily have apprehended our Saviour's Meaning to be, when He calls the Wine *the New Covenant in his Blood*, will be reasonable in us to accept for the true one. Now as the Disciples knew, that the Blood of the Paschal Lamb that was at first sprinkled, was the Seal of the Covenant that God enter'd into with their Forefathers in *Egypt*, of which the Blood ever after pour'd out before the Lord was *a Memorial*; and as they believ'd their drinking of the Cup call'd *the Cup of Salvation*, at the close of the *Paschal Supper*, was the Means of their renewing the said Covenant, and applying to themselves the Blessings and Privileges of it; and as these Things were familiar to them, and they had just then been bringing them to their Minds in the Performance of the Paschal Ceremonies; it seems necessary to suppose, that they cou'd not understand what our Saviour says of the *Cup's* being the *New Covenant in his Blood*, in any other Sense, but as a Means  
of

of conveying to them the Benefits and Advantages of that *New Covenant* He was just then about to *Seal* with his own *Bloud*. And what wou'd the more confirm them in this Notion, is, the Conformity that there is between the Expression here, and what was used in a parallel Case when God establish'd his Covenant with *Abraham*. For God then says — *This is the Covenant that I will make with you. Every Male among you shall be circumcised\**. Here the Circumcision of every Male is call'd God's Covenant with *Abraham*, just as in the Words of the Institution *The Cup* or *Wine* is call'd *the Covenant*. But they knew, and we know, that the Rite of Circumcision was not a bare Sign of there being a Covenant between God and *Abraham* and his Seed, but was a *Seal* of the same also, an actual declaring and confirming the same, and an Application of the *Benefits* thereof to those who receiv'd it. And how was it then that the *Disciples* could understand the *same* Expression in a *like* Case but in a *like* Sense?

THIRDLY, you affirm that the *Remem-*

\* Gen. 17. 10.

*brance*

*brance of Christ* is the *End* and *Design* of this *Holy Rite*. Now here you seem to me to mistake one of the *Parts* of this *Rite* for the *End* thereof. The Remembrance of Christ is doubtless a necessary and an *essential Part* of this Duty, and without it, all the other *Parts* together will be of no real *Benefit* and *Advantage*. But it is neither *properly* nor *truly* call'd the *End* of the Duty. For the *End* of it must certainly be something different from the *Parts* that compose it. The first *End* of this Duty is, to pay a *Religious Honour* to our Lord and Saviour; and the next *End*, which is indeed the certain Effect and Consequence of the former, is, to *obtain the Favour of God*. Neither of these *Ends* are *express'd* in the Words of the *Institution*, but they are *both* necessarily *imply'd*, and do follow from the Nature of the *Duty* it self. You make mention of *one*, and 'tis easy to shew, there is the same Reason for supposing the *other*. You acknowledge — That *Christians by partaking of the BODY and BLOOD of Christ in the Lord's Supper* \*, declare themselves devoted and subject to Christ, as their *COMMON HEAD*, and publickly acknowledge

\* Pag. 35.

*Him to be their MASTER, and themselves to be his Disciples, and to be under his Governance, and Influence, and that they thereby pay a Religious Honour to Him\**. The paying a Religious Honour to Christ then, is, altho' not express'd in the Words of the Institution, one End of this Holy Rite, according to your own Notion of the Matter. But does not this End manifestly imply and infer the other? Is not every Act of Religion perform'd in View of a Recompence of Reward for the same, by the Return of some Instance or other of the *Divine Favour*? And are there not various *Promises* of God given for the very Purpose of encouraging us to hope for such *Returns* and to expect them? Has not God expressly declar'd that *them that Honour Him He will Honour* †? If it be then one End of the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, to do Honour to our Lord and Master, a Second End of it must be to procure the *Blessing and Favour of God*, upon those who partake of it. For *Acts of Religious Duty*, and *Returns of Benefits and Blessings* are ever reciprocal. Indeed, if our *Blessed Saviour* had been a mere Man, had been commis-

\* Pag. 58.

† 1 Sam. 2. 30.



sion'd by GOD as *Moses* was, to deliver his Mind to the World, without any *Dignity* of Nature above other Men, it might have been the Design of GOD to have suffer'd Him to appoint a *Solemn Memorial* of what He did and suffer'd, *in Honour to Himself*, and that his *Name* and *Glory* might be *magnify'd* among Men, and this, as a *Reward* for his Obedience and Sufferings. In which Case the *Honour* paid to Him wou'd be the discharging of a Debt on our Parts, and the *sole End* of it wou'd be the *setting forth his Glory*. But the Holy Scriptures having taught us, that He is not our *Master* only, but our *Creator* and *Redeemer* also, of infinite *Dignity* and *Power*, and that He is to be worship'd as our GOD, *and to be Honour'd even as we Honour the Father\**, 'tis absolutely evident, that the *Memorial* requir'd is design'd for his *Honour*, in the same Sense *only* as all Acts of Adoration and Worship are Instances of *Honour* pay'd to GOD; which whilst they are *thus call'd* and *so accepted*, are at once *Honourable* and *Beneficial* to those who perform them, and are appointed as the Means of *their Good* and *Happiness*. And how un-

\* *Joh. 5. 23.*

willing soever you are to allow this, and notwithstanding your absolute Silence concerning it at this Place where it ought to have been mention'd, you seem afterwards to have had some Regret for having represented the Words of the Institution as so intirely barren of all Encouragement to hope for any *Blessings* as the certain Consequences of a due Performance of this Duty; For about a hundred Pages afterwards you acknowledge that all those *Privileges* or *Benefits* are truly and certainly annex'd to this Duty, or implied in it, that either in general are promis'd or naturally belong to a sincere Obedience to any positive Commands of God\*. But what is truly and certainly annex'd to a Duty as a Privilege or a Benefit, must be esteem'd one *End* and *Design* of the performing that Duty, and if so, then the *Remembrance* requir'd is not properly the *End* and *Design* of this Duty, but a *Means* only of performing it in such a Manner, as to make it the happy Occasion of *Benefit* and *Blessing* to the Performers of it.

\* Pag. 153.

THE Summ of the Matter, and what I will venture to leave with the Reader as an Answer to your *Paraphrase* upon the Words of the *Institution*, and your *Eighth Proposition*, is this — Since the Holy *Rite* of the *Lord's Supper* was appointed to be perform'd in a Religious *Remembrance* of the Passion of our *Lord*, who is our God and Saviour, the Author of all the Mercies we enjoy, or hope for, and that it must therefore be a high Act of *Religious Worship*; and since the Words of the *Institution*, wherein the *Bread* is so emphatically call'd his *Body*, and the *Wine* his *Bloud*, do so easily lead us to the Expectation of their being what they are call'd, in the Sense of their conveying to the Soul a Supply of *Strength* and *Refreshment* in Analogy to that *Nourishment* they *naturally* give the *Body*; and since the *Cup*, which is so expressly call'd *The Bloud of the New Covenant*, may justly be thought to be as truly and with as *real Effect* call'd so, as Circumcision was call'd the *Covenant of God*, that is, in the Sense of being a *Seal* thereof, and a *Means* of applying the *Privileges* and *Benefits* of it to *worthy Receivers*; all Christians have just Reason to expect  
great

great *Advantages* from the due Participation of the Holy Mysteries.

I MUST now take Notice of a *Sage Observation* that you are pleas'd to make upon the *Shortness, Plainness* and *Simplicity* of this *Holy Institution*, which is, that *The four several Accounts of the Institution, will all united hardly make up a FEW PAGES, of the least of those many Treatises, which have been written upon this Subject since the first Ages\**. But to what Purpose is this Observation? May not the Books have been *useful*, and may not the Importance of the Subject justify the *Pains* that have been employ'd upon it, notwithstanding the Words that first directed the *Duty* were few and plain? Is not the most important Proposition in the whole Compass of *Science*, and in the Proof and Illustration of which, the *Wit* and *Learning* of the greatest Men of all Ages have most commendably been employ'd, compriz'd in as few Word as possible? And are those Volumes that have been written the less useful, because the Subject of them is contain'd in these *two short Monosyllables*,

\* Pag. 21, 22

GOD IS? Tho' your Observation is certainly true, I am greatly at a loss for the *Per-tinence* of it.

INDEED, the absurd Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* maintain'd by the *Romanists*, and the many precarious and doubtful, not to say absurd *Hypotheses* of others, invented for the Explication of the Manner of Christ's Presence in the *Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, have furnish'd out numerous *Volumes* of Controversy, that have but little serv'd the true Interests of *Christianity*. But it is not the less true, that the Labours of *Pious Men* have been well employ'd in setting forth the *Dignity* of this Ordinance, and explaining the *Use* and *Benefits*, and *Means* of worthily partaking thereof, in order to guard it against that Profaneness and Contempt which too *low* Notions concerning it might occasion: and as notwithstanding the great Number of Books already written upon this Subject, you have thought fit to increase it, by a Book of your own, so 'tis highly probable, yours will be followed by others you will as little like as those you now blame.

BUT



BUT I cannot dismiss this Point without taking Notice of the very *unfair* Use you make of the suppos'd ill Tendency of some of the *Treatises* upon this Subject\*, as if they *but too much help'd* to render THAT a Matter of Intricacy and Terror (and this chiefly to honest Christians) which their Master left in the greatest Plainness and Simplicity. For you take Occasion from hence to appeal to the Judgment of every sincere Christian of the lowest Understanding, whether more Regard ought not to be pay'd, to our Blessed Lord himself, in a Point that depended intirely upon his Will, than to any of those who cannot pretend to have had their Instruction from Him; or whether it be not more pious (as well as more reasonable) to believe that our Lord Himself declar'd his Mind sufficiently about his own Institution, to his own immediate Followers; than to imagine that He left it to be declar'd for Him, by Men who should live one Hundred, or five Hundred, or a Thousand, or near two Thousand Years, after the first Institution of this Duty.

\* Pag. 22.

Now

Now how *fallacious* is this Appeal, and how full of *low Art* and *Sophistry*? For do you not appeal to the plain Christians Judgment upon the Supposition of a *Fact* as *agreed to* and acknowledged, which is yet flatly *deny'd* by all your Adversaries that are not Members of the *Church of Rome*? I know of no *Protestant Writer* whatsoever who does not *believe that our Lord himself declared his Mind sufficiently about his own Institution, to his own immediate Followers.* And it is a *mean Art* thus to prepossess your Readers in favour of your *Performance*, by a groundless Suggestion against those who differ from you in their Notions upon this Subject. And I think there is very little Foundation for the Reflection you make upon many of the *Pious Authors* of the Treatises you allude to, as guilty of *infusing Terror and Superstition into Honest Minds.* For the *very Few* that may be supposed to have received any wrong Impressions from the Strictness of *Preparation*, enjoyn'd by some of those *Authors*, are all of a Melancholic Turn of Mind, who are wont to find out for *themselves* Occasions of *Perplexity* and *Terror*, whether any are  
 thrown

thrown in their Way or no. And it is very usual for them to be *scared* by their own *deluded Imaginations*, where there are no *just Grounds of Fear*.

So that I believe the *Books*, you hint at, have done very little Hurt even to those who are most capable of the *Terrors* and *Superstition* you so often mention. But in general such Rules for a severe and punctual *Preparation* are certainly very *serviceable*. And for one that receives Hurt from their being *strain'd* too high, there are Multitudes who wou'd be in Danger of utter Ruin, if they were to be much *relax'd*. And for this Reason I cannot but think, that *the Manner* in which you have treated this Subject, has a very bad and fatal Tendency, without any likelihood of compassing the only *End* you seems to have had in View. For altho' you have hereby made *Sport* for Infidels, and *griev'd* the Minds of many serious Christians, yet I verily think, you will not really either *dispel the Fears*, or *cure the Superstition* of any *one* of the unhappy Persons for whom you profess so much *Care* and *Solicitude*.

H

BEFORE

BEFORE I dismiss this Part of your *Performance*, I must be farther free with you, and demand, how, upon a Subject of this Kind, you could avoid saying Something of that Notion of the *Commemoration* or *Remembrance* requir'd, which has been entertain'd by so many Persons of the greatest Name, as well among the *Antients* as *Moderns*, which is quite of another Kind, from yours, and which if true, quite ruins your whole *Scheme*.

SURELY you must know that the ἀνάμνησις or *Commemoration*, is by many understood as a *Memorial* to GOD the Father of what his Son hath done for Mankind, and that *His Passion* is exhibited to GOD under the Symbols of *Bread* and *Wine* in Testimony of our *Faith* in the Satisfaction of his Death, and in Hopes of *propitiating* God thereby.

THIS Notion of the ἀνάμνησις or *Remembrance*, is perfectly agreeable to the ancient Liturgies, and is directly asserted by many of the earliest *Fathers* of the Church, and by many Persons of the greatest Distinction

tion for *Piety and Learning* among *Protestants*.

Now since you profess to lay down what you have to say, in so plain and intelligible a Manuer, that every Christian, capable of thinking at all, upon this Subject, may be able immediately to see, whether it conveys to Him the true Notions of this DUTY, left us by CHRIST and his APOSTLES, or not\*; I think you do by no Means deal fairly by your Readers in not acquainting them with a Notion, that has so many Vouchers, and which moreover, if true, destroys all your Reasoning upon this Point. For your whole Scheme subsists intirely upon the Supposition of a Remembrance of quite another Kind, and which is perform'd not by representing our Saviour's Death to God, but in laying it before our own Minds. It was therefore incumbent upon you not only with Regard to the serious Protestants you undertake to instruct, but the Papists also whom you profess to confute, not only to have mention'd, but solidly to have refuted that Meaning of the ἀνάμνησις before mention'd; because

\* Pag. 2.



if *true*, it does not only (as I said) destroy the Argument of your Book, but (which is indeed a Matter of much more Importance) gives the *Romanists* a Handle to evade the Force of whatever you have urged against their *monstrous* Doctrines of *Transubstantiation*, and the Sacrifice of Christ's natural Body in the Lord's Supper.

Do not mistake me here; I do not mean to say, that *your* Sense of the ἀνάμνησις gives any Advantage to the *Romanists*: But I say, you ought to have confuted *their* Sense of it, before you had undertaken to shew the Absurdity of supposing *The Presence of the Natural Body and Bloud of Christ* in the Eucharist, merely upon the Strength of *your* Way of understanding the ἀνάμνησις. Because, whilst you charge *them* with an Absurdity for teaching that *Christians eat Christ's real Natural BODY in REMEMBRANCE of his real Natural BODY, and drink his real BLOOD in REMEMBRANCE of his real BLOOD* \*, as if they taught thereby that *Christians are to do Something in Order to REMEMBER Him, which at the same Time supposes Him*

\* Pag. 25.

*corporally present, and so destroys the very Notion of that REMEMBRANCE; Whilst I say, you charge this upon them as an Absurdity, and leave them in Possession of their own Notion of the ἀνάμνησις, they have their Answer ready, and will alledge, that altho' the Absurdity wou'd be as you represent it, upon your Notion of the Remembrance, yet that it is no Absurdity upon their own; forasmuch as they understand the ἀνάμνησις or Commemoration to be made to God, and not to the MINDS of the Receivers, and that the Body and Bloud of Christ, are offer'd to God as Memorials to HIM, and not exhibited to the Receivers as Means to them, of their considering the Death of Christ.*

THE *Advantage* that you have given the *Romanists* hereby, is, that you have slighted the Power you had of exposing the *Absurdity* of their Doctrine concerning the Presence of the Natural *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*, in the usual Way, upon *Principles* that are *demonstrable*, and clear as the Sun, in order to do it in a  
Manner

Manner *peculiar* to your self, and upon a Principle that *they deny*, and you have not attempted to *prove*.

I AM as far from believing the Popish Doctrines of Transubstantiation and a Sacrifice of *Christ's Natural Body and Bloud* in the *Lord's Supper* as you can be, or any one else. I think they have no Kind of Foundation in the *Holy Scriptures*, and that they are withal *absurd* and *impossible*, inconsistent with all Principles of *Science*, and destructive of that great Foundation of Certainty, *The Evidence of Sense*.

AND after I have declar'd this, I will not scruple to declare also that I think all those five Pages that come between your *Eighth and Ninth Propositions* to be to so very little Purpose of Reason and Argument against those you are *opposing*, that I am astonish'd how they could drop from your Pen. They contain indeed Arguments most certainly conclusive upon the *Principles* of those who understand the *Remembrance* in the Sense you do, but if they are brought to confute *Romanists* (for which Purpose they

they must be intended, or they serve no Purpose at all) whilst you permit *them* to retain their own *Notion* of the *Remembrance* before mention'd, they are so far from being *just* Arguments, that they are no better than a String of *complete Blunders*.

BUT this wou'd the less have stood in need of Censure, if you had not been so mighty fond of your *New Application* of the *Common Notion* of the *Remembrance*, as to cast a *Blot* upon all other Arguments against *Transubstantiation* and the Sacrifice of *Christ's natural Body and Bloud in the Eucharist*. But this you have done in the following remarkable Words. — *These Arguments drawn from the great End of the INSTITUTION it self, are more plain and easy to Common Understandings, than those which are taken from the absolute Impossibility of the Thing it self, which tho' they are strong, and never to be truly answer'd, yet give the Adversaries a much greater Opportunity of perplexing and confounding the Ignorant with Disputes about the Power of an Almighty God, and the Nature of Body\**.

\* Pag. 27.

BUT

BUT thus to give up Arguments as difficult and abstruse, and not easily to be apprehended by *Common Understandings*, which have been hitherto look'd upon as *Demonstrative*, and have been used with so very great *Success* among Persons of all Capacities is a Conduct (whether you have substituted Arguments equally conclusive in the room of *them* or no) very odd, and very blameable.

IT seems to have something of the *Empiric* in it too, and puts me in Mind of those Persons, who, when they think they have made some *Discovery* in the *Art* of *Physic*, are presently big with *Hopes* concerning it, expect their *Nostrum* shou'd do most surprizing *Feats*, shou'd *cure* every Malady, and in a Manner supersede the Use of all other *Medicines* whatsoever. But to return.

WHATSOEVER may be the Truth, as to the Notion of *the Remembrance* requir'd, this is certain, that the Notion of it must be always different, (which you seem not to have sufficiently attended to) according  
as



as Men entertain the Opinion of the *Lord's Supper's* being a *Sacrifice*, or a *Sacrament*.

AFTER what has been already said, I think I need make no Observations upon your *Ninth Proposition*, or your *Comment* upon it; wherefore I proceed to your *Tenth Proposition*, which is this.

X. *There being other Passages of the New Testament besides those already cited, which occasionally relate to this Subject: It is of Importance to all Christians to consider them; and to examine what farther Instructions they contain about this Holy Rite.*

THE First is in 1 Cor. 10. ver. 16. *The Cup of Blessing, which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Bloud of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?*

17. *For we being many, are one Bread, and one Body. For we are all partakers of that one Bread.*

18. *Behold Israel after the Flesh: Are not they*

*they which eat of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar?*

19. *What say I then? That the Idol is any Thing, or that which is offer'd to Idols, is any Thing?*

20. *But I say that the Things which the Gentiles Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils, and not to God: And I would not that you should have Fellowship with Devils.*

21. *Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's Table, and of the Table of Devils.*

THIS Passage is of so great Consequence in the present Debate, and is, when rightly explain'd, so *decisive* against the whole Purport of your Book, that I do not wonder to find you have used your utmost Endeavours to explain away the *true Design* of it.

You begin with a labour'd Paraphrase upon the Words, which is much too long to be recited here, but the Substance of it, as I take it, is as follows. — “ When we  
“ *Christians partake in common* of the Cup  
“ *of Blessing*, do we not partake of it as  
“ Wine

" Wine appointed to be a *Memorial* of the  
 " *Bloud* of Christ shed for us? Is it not there-  
 " fore a *joint partaking* of what brings his  
 " *Bloud* to our *Remembrance*? When in the  
 " same Solemnity we *break* and eat *Bread*,  
 " is it not the *joint partaking* of that which  
 " is appointed for the Remembrance of his  
 " *Body*? and not eating the *Bread* as at an  
 " ordinary Meal? By which partaking of  
 " *one* Bread as *one* Company, we acknow-  
 " ledge ourselves to be *one* Society *subject*  
 " to *Christ*. In the same Manner, the *Jews*  
 " who eat any Part of what had been  
 " *sacrificed* upon the *Altar* of the *true* God,  
 " own'd themselves to be *Worshippers* of *Him*.  
 " When I apply this to the *Heathens* and  
 " the *Sacrifices* to their *Idols*, I do not mean  
 " to affirm, that the *Idols* in their Tem-  
 " ples are any *real Beings*, or that what is  
 " sacrificed to *them* is in Truth different  
 " from *Common Flesh*; but this I say, that  
 " they intend these *Sacrifices* to *real Beings*,  
 " to *Demons*, whom they honour as *Gods*.  
 " Upon this Account I would not have  
 " you eat in common with the *Heathens*,  
 " what is Religiously sacrificed to those  
 " supposed *Demons*, because you would ap-  
 " pear,

“ pear to pay an Honour to a *Demon*, in  
 “ Derogation to the true God, which wou’d  
 “ give Encouragement to *Idolatry*. This  
 “ Behaviour cannot be justify’d in you, who  
 “ are oblig’d to discourage that Worship  
 “ which *Christ* came to abolish. You can-  
 “ not without Guilt partake of the *Lord’s*  
 “ *Table*, and the Tables of these *false Gods*,  
 “ you cannot perform one Religious Action  
 “ in Honour to *Christ*, and another of the  
 “ same Kind seemingly in Honour to *Idols*,  
 “ without Inconsistency, and bad Conse-  
 “ quences.”

You tell us the Interpretation put upon  
 this Passage by many learned Men \*, of its  
 signifying a *Communion* or partaking of *all*  
*the Benefits* of *Christ’s Body* broken, and *Bloud*  
*shed*, could not have been in *St. Paul’s*  
*Thoughts*, as at all proper for his *Argument*.  
*On the contrary* you say, the Words here made  
*use of*, cannot have this Signification, and that  
*the Apostle’s Argument* neither requires it, nor  
*admits of it*.

\* Pag. 39.

IN Answer to which I shall now undertake to shew, that the *Apostle's Argument* does not only allow us to suppose, that *Benefits and Blessings* may be imparted to us by the *Communion* of our Saviour's *Body and Bloud* here mention'd, but that it receives great *Strength and Weight* from the Supposition, nay, that it does moreover absolutely require it.

BUT before I enter upon this, I must repeat my *Charge* against you for using those Persons *unfairly*, whom you undertake to instruct. For since you profess to lay every Thing before them in so clear a Manner, that they shall be able immediately to see whether you convey to them the true Notions of this Duty left us by Christ or not, they had a Right to an open and fair Representation of the Case, and nothing ought to have been conceal'd from them, that is of Weight in the Argument.

NOW you have here, as before, taken for granted, without any Manner of Proof, several Particulars, upon the suppos'd Truth of which, the whole Argument of your

Para-



*Paraphrase* upon this *Passage* rests, which are yet all of them, not only *disputable*, but *false*.

1. YOU understand the Word *κοινωνία* [Communion] when apply'd to the *Body and Bloud of Christ*, in the Sense of partaking of them with this single *Effect*, that the Receivers do thereby declare themselves Members of that Society, of which He is the *Head*.

Now altho' 'tis certain, the true Meaning of this *Communion* must at last be determin'd by the Sense it will most conveniently bear, as a Part of the Apostle's Argument in this Place; yet your Readers ought to have been told, that it usually signifies in other Parts of Scripture, a *Participation of Somewhat* with real and beneficial Effects, and not a *Badge and Token of Membership* only. Thus, that by *Communion of the Holy Ghost*\*, is understood a joint Reception of the *Gifts and Graces*, and *Beneficial Influences* of the *Holy Ghost*. And that when the same Word is apply'd to

\* 2 Cor. 13. 14.

the Holy Spirit in another Place, and render'd *FELLOWSHIP of the Spirit*\*, a joint Participation is meant as in a *Common Stock* of the *Gifts* and *Operations* of the *Holy Spirit of God*. Again, that when the Word is apply'd to signify a Participation of the *Mystery of the Gospel*, by *Jews and Gentiles*†, it is manifestly in the Sense of their both *equally sharing* in the *Benefits* thereof. For by these and more Passages that might be cited to the same Purpose, it appears, that the Word is usually apply'd to signify a Partnership, as in a *Common Stock* of certain Privileges and *Benefits*.

WHY shou'd not the Reader then have been made acquainted with this, that He might have judg'd for Himself, whether it is not reasonable that the Word shou'd have a like Meaning in this Place? The Merits of *Christ's* Death, and the *Blessings* thereby purchased for his Church, are an *inexhaustible Fund*, out of which every Member is supply'd, according to his respective *spiritual* Wants. And why then shou'd not the *Communion* here mention'd, be understood in the

\* *Phil* 2. 1.

† *Eph*. 3. 9.

Sense of a joint Participation in those *Blessings* and *Benefits*? Do not the Words *Body* and *Bloud of Christ*, of which Christians are said expressly to *partake*, naturally lead to such an Acceptation?

THIS then being the Case, it is very strange, that you should thus take the Words in your own *Sense*, only to strengthen your *Paraphrase*, without apprizing your Readers of what was to be objected to it; and surely this is a Proceeding much more *artful*, than *reputable*.

2. THE Second exceptionable Particular of your *Paraphrase* is, that you take for granted, that the Apostle by this Expression, *are not they which eat of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar*? Means no more, than that "they who eat of the Sacrifices offer'd to the true God, did thereby profess themselves his Worshippers, as truly as if they had themselves offer'd the Sacrifices up on the Altar." Whereas it is evident, the Apostle must mean, that they were thereby partakers of all the *Benefits* that accrued

crued to the *Jews* from the Worship of the true God.

FOR the *Altar* was the great Means or Instrument of conveying to the *Jews* the Benefits of their being in *Covenant* with God. Upon *that* were the *Burnt-Offerings* and *Sin-Offerings* appointed to be offer'd for the *Sins* of the *Congregation* \*. Of these some were wholly consum'd by Fire, of others Part was consum'd by Fire, and Part was eaten by the Priests. The *Peace-Offerings* were those only of which the People eat any Part †; Part of which was consum'd by Fire, and Part was eaten by those who brought the Sacrifice.

BUT tho' this was the Case with Regard to the several Kinds of Sacrifice, yet they were all, as well those of which the People eat no Part, as those of which they did, declar'd to be an Attonement for the whole *Congregation* ‡, and to make *Reconciliation* for the *House of Israel* ||.

\* Lev. 4. 21.

† Lev. 7. 11.

‡ Lev. 16. 33.

|| Ezek. 43. 27. 45. 17.

BUT how were they effectual to *particular Persons*, for this Purpose? Why, plainly by *their* partaking of the *Altar* whereon they were offer'd. And in what did that consist, but in *eating of the Sacrifices*? The *eating of the Sacrifices* then was the Means to the People of their receiving the *Benefits* expected from the *Altar*.

OUR Apostle therefore must mean by the *Jews partaking of the Altar* in this Place, that they did thereby partake of the *Blessings* of their Religion; receiv'd the *Benefits* promised to them from their several *Sacrifices*, were admitted to a *Communion* or *Partnership*, in all the *Expiations* of the *Altar*, provided they perform'd the *Commands* of the *Law*, and fulfill'd the *Ordinances* thereof.

AND this indeed was no more than what the *Heathens themselves* expected from *their* *Sacrifices*. The *Altar* was with them the *Instrument*, whereby the *Effects* of the *Worship* they pay'd to their *false Gods*, were supposed to be convey'd to them. And as every *Religious Rite* and *Ceremony* whatsoever, does in the *Nature* of the *Thing*,  
carry



carry the Supposition of its being perform'd to the Honour of the Object worshipp'd, in View of its being a Means of Pardon and Propitiation, so especially were *Sacrifices* understood to have this Virtue.

3. THE Third Particular which you have assum'd as evident in your Paraphrase, and of which you make great use, in Order to evade the true Sense of the Apostle in this Place, is, that the *Devils* here mention'd, should be translated *Demons*, in the Sense of *inferior Gods*, notwithstanding the Original Word *Δαιμόνια* is always used in the New Testament without one Exception to the contrary, to signify *Wicked Spirits the Devil and his Angels*.

THESE Things being premised, it will not be difficult, to detect the *Fallacy* of your Reasoning upon this *Passage of St. Paul*, and to shew what I just now undertook, namely, that the Apostle's Argument does not only allow us to suppose that *Benefits* may be imparted by the *Communion* here mentioned, but that it receives great *Force* and *Weight*

from the Supposition, and that it does more-  
over require it.

Now I cannot but think it something extraordinary, that you will not allow the Notion of Benefits conferr'd in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to be so much as *consistent* with this Argument of St. Paul; for one would be apt to think it might at least be so, unless it appear'd to be his Mind professedly to *oppose* it. And indeed the *Consistency* of this Supposition with the Apostle's Argument, seems plain to me even upon your own *State* of it. For since you represent the Apostle as shewing the Absurdity of the *Corinthians* in eating of the *Heathen* Sacrifices, from their making outward Profession of doing *Honour to Christ*, by partaking of his *Supper* in a solemn *Remembrance* of Him, "and yet appearing to pay the same  
" Sort of Honour to false Gods, by feast-  
" ing with their Votaries upon their Sacri-  
" fices; surely this Practice will not appear the less absurd or inconsistent, if, whilst they *Honour* their Master, they should be rewarded also with some *Benefits* and good

" *Influences*

*Influences* from their partaking of his *Body* and *Bloud*.

IF this Supposition *gives no Strength* to the Argument, I cannot, for my Heart, see how it *abates the Force* of it, and if it shou'd be allow'd that the Conclusion would be good *without it*, yet certainly the Argument can never be hurt or weaken'd *by it*.

BUT this shall not content me; I will farther shew, that the Supposition adds great *Weight* and *Force* to the Argument. But in order to this, I must no longer trust to your State of it.

I SHALL therefore my self now propose the Argument in its true and just Light, as to the general Purport of it, and it stands thus.

“ BY a joint partaking of the Body and  
 “ Bloud of Christ, you profess your Sub-  
 “ jection to Him, and hold COMMUNION  
 “ with Him, whereby you are made Par-  
 “ takers of the Benefits of his Passion; these  
 “ Actions therefore, having this Meaning  
 “ and

“ and Effect, as indeed all Religious Rites  
 “ whatsoever are perform’d in View to  
 “ some Benefit, and Advantage from the  
 “ Object worship’d, and this is remarkably  
 “ so, in the Case of the *Jews*, who by  
 “ eating of the Sacrifices held COMMUNION  
 “ with God, by being made Partakers of  
 “ all the Expiations of the ALTAR. These  
 “ Actions then having this allow’d Design  
 “ and Effect in them, it is not only AB-  
 “ SURD and INEXCUSABLE but IDOLATROUS  
 “ in you to partake with the *Heathens* in  
 “ feasting upon their Sacrifices, whereby  
 “ you not only profess Honour to their  
 “ Gods, but declare your Expectation of  
 “ Help and Succour from them, whereby  
 “ you do not only give Encouragement  
 “ to the *Heathens* to continue in their Ido-  
 “ latry, but do indeed join with them in  
 “ the Abomination.

AND from this true State of the Argu-  
 ment, as to the general Purport of it, it is  
 easy to answer all that you have advanced  
 from the 40th to the 47th Page. For  
 whereas you say, *it being the Apostle’s Design*  
*to incite the Corinthians to flee from Idolatry*  
 Ch.

Ch. 10. 14. *by shewing them what a Crime it would be in them to do (what was accounted) HONOUR to the Gods of the Heathens by feasting upon their Sacrifices, it was not to his Purpose to say, by eating Bread and drinking Wine in the Lord's Supper, you partake of all the Benefits of Christ's Death, and therefore you cannot eat of the Heathen Sacrifices\*:*

It now appears to have great Weight in the Argument, in as much as it amounts to a Charge upon *them* of making the same outward Profession of receiving helpful Influences from the Heathen Gods, that good Men did indeed receive from the Worship of the true God. For if it was Criminal in a *Christian* to pay any Degree of Honour to the *Heathen Gods*, surely it was much more so, and came still nearer to the Idolatry He was warning the *Corinthians* to flee from, to shew the highest Act of Religious Honour to them, and what amounted to an Acknowledgment of their Sovereign Power, and that they were able to *save and to destroy*.



So when you farther contend *that in that Part of the Argument where the Apostle mentions the JEWS, He cannot be understood to have had in his Thoughts any BENEFITS, to which they were entitled who eat of the Sacrifices, because He meant only to shew that the PEOPLE by eating of the Sacrifices did HONOUR to GOD, in as true a Manner, as if they had offer'd the Sacrifices themselves upon the Altar, and had eaten of them there* \*. When you argue thus, I say, 'tis plain you draw your Conclusion merely from your own *unsupported Supposition*, which is, that the People by eating of the Sacrifices partook of the *Altar*, and thereby did Honour to God, as much as the *Priests* who offer'd the Sacrifices; whereas in Truth the Apostle's Design was not to compare the Case of the *Eaters* with that of the *Sacrificers*, which was foreign to the Point in hand, but to shew, that *eating* of the Sacrifices, was the true and proper Means of *partaking* of the *Altar*, in the Sense of being thereby admitted to the Benefits of all those Expiations which were completed upon the *Altar*.

\* Pag. 41, 42.

Now when the Case is represented in this View, 'tis very evident, the Argument of the Apostle is greatly strengthen'd against the Practice He is condemning; And it stands thus.

“ THE *Jews* by *eating* of the Sacrifices  
 “ did *partake of the Altar*, and all the Bene-  
 “ fits of the Expiations perform'd upon it;  
 “ therefore, when you *eat* of the *Heathen*  
 “ Sacrifices, and thereby perform the same  
 “ outward Action, which entitles the *Jews*  
 “ to the *favour* of the *true God*, you make  
 “ a like Profession of your Dependence  
 “ upon the *Gods of the Heathens* for their  
 “ Favour.”

AND I cannot see how a better Argument against the Practice of the *Corinthians* of *eating* in the *Idol-Temples* can be form'd than this.

AND whereas you observe, *there is nothing to answer to these Benefits, in the Opposition made in the Conclusion, between the TABLE and CUP of the LORD, and the TABLE and CUP of DEVILS, you cannot be partakers of the*

L

Lord's

*Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils\**; For that the Meaning of this Conclusion cannot be this; *Ye cannot be Partakers of the BENEFITS of the Lord's Table, and the BENEFITS of the Tables of the Heathen Deities*; This is downright Blunder and Absurdity. For the Opposition, 'tis most evident, is not between the *Benefits of one Table* and the *Benefits of another*, but between *one Table* and *the other*, upon the Account of *real Benefits* receiv'd from *one*, and *Benefits supposed only* to be received from the *other*, which Acknowledgment of *Benefits* where there were really none, and cou'd be none, is the very Ground of the Guilt of the *Corinthians* in their Practice of *eating in the Idol-Temples*.

THE *Opposition* therefore is thus truly represented: *Ye cannot be Partakers of the Lord's Table*, where inestimable *Benefits* are receiv'd, and be Partakers of the *Tables of Devils*, and thereby *profess* to receive the same *Benefits* from them. For this is an utter Inconsistency in Practice, and will destroy all the Advantage and good Effect of

\* Pag. 43.

being *Christians*. It is indeed rank Idolatry, and a professing your selves Approvers of that very Worship your *Lord* came into the World to destroy.

WHEN therefore at the Beginning of the Argument, and in order to infer his Conclusion, the Apostle asks; *The Cup which we bless is it not the COMMUNION of the Bloud of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the COMMUNION of the Body of Christ?* He must be supposed to mean, what was so much to his Purpose, that by the *Communion of Christ's Body and Bloud* in the Lord's Supper, the Faithful did really receive the *Benefits* of his Passion; because He might from hence so much more forcibly infer, that *Christians* ought not to feed with the *Heathens* upon their Sacrifices, since they would thereby appear to acknowledge their receiving like *Beneficial Influences* from thence, which was not only inconsistent with the Character of a *Christian*, but a downright Act of *Idolatry*; the persuading them to flee from which, was the Purpose of the whole Argument.

BUT I have not yet done with the Argument, nor with you. I have hitherto only endeavour'd to shew, that the Supposition of *Benefits* conferr'd by the *Communion* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* in the *Lord's Supper*, is not only consistent with the *Apostle's* Argument, but a strengthening of it also: I shall now shew that the Supposition is moreover *necessary*, and that the Argument does *absolutely* require it.

I HAVE yet taken no Notice of those Words in the *Apostle's* Argument where He asks; — *What say I then? that the Idol is any Thing? or that which is offer'd to Idols is any Thing?* But, I say, that the Things which the *Gentiles* Sacrifice, they Sacrifice to Devils, and not to God, and I would not that you should have Fellowship with Devils. 'Tis certain, the right understanding of these Words gives a *new Turn* to the Argument, and your *artful* Pains to elude the Force of them, and to hide it from the Observation of your Reader, is not one of the least Instances of your *dexterity*.

I OBSERVE



I OBSERVE that when, in your 38<sup>th</sup> Page, you give the Apostle's Argument in short, you wholly omit the giving any Sense of these Words, as tho' they had nothing to do in the Argument at all, and indeed the Sense you give of them in your *long Paraphrase* upon the whole Argument shews plainly you knew not what to do with them, nor which Way to explain them, so that they might not prejudice your Representation of the Argument. Your Words are these.

WHEN I apply this to the Heathens around you and the Sacrifices to their Idols, I do not mean to affirm that the Idols in their Temples, to which they offer Sacrifice, ARE ANY REAL BEINGS; or that what they Sacrifice, to them is in truth, even after such Sacrifice, at all different in it self, from any other Common Flesh. But this I say, that the Heathens themselves certainly think of these Offerings, and intend them as Sacrifices (not to nothing, but) to SOME REAL BEINGS, to whom they imagin them to be acceptable.\*

\* Pag. 35.

Now

Now here because there is a plain *Opposition* made by the Apostle between the *Idols* in the 19<sup>th</sup> Verse and *the Devils* mention'd in the 20<sup>th</sup>, you wou'd seem to express that *Opposition* in your *Paraphrase*; but how do you do it? Not by representing the *Opposition* evidently meant by the Apostle, but an *Opposition* of your own devising, for which there is no Foundation in the *Text*, and which cannot be meant without Absurdity. The *Opposition* it seems according to you consists in this; That *Idols are no real Beings*; but that *Demons* have a true and real Existence.

Now is it not evident that *Idols* and *Demons*, as to the *Reality* of their Existence cannot differ; for, does not a Stock and a Stone *exist*, as well as a Man, a Devil, or an Angel? When the Apostle therefore asks — *What say I then, that the Idol is any Thing?* 'Tis certain He means by that Question to assert, that an *Idol is nothing* as to *Power* and *Influence*, or any Effect that it cou'd have in the Way of *Help* or *Hurt* to those who worship'd before it. And if this was the Case, what was the Difference between

between an *Idol* and a *Demon* or the Soul of a dead Man? Was there any more *Power* in one than the other to *save* or to *destroy*? There was indeed more *Reality* of Existence in the *Idols*, than in many of those *supposed inferior Gods*, that were worship'd by the *Heathens*; but the *Power* of one and the other was just the same, even *nothing*. Nor do you, nor does your Manner of representing the Apostle's Argument, suffer you to suppose, that there was, or could be a greater Ability in these *Demons* to have any *Influence* upon their Votaries, than the Dumb Lifeless *Idols* themselves.

It does not alter the Case to say, that the *Heathens* thought otherwise. For the Apostle is not speaking of what the *Heathens* thought, but what was the Truth and Reality of the Matter. He denies indeed that the *Idols* were any Thing, or that any *Influence* cou'd derive from them; but He affirms that *the Beings* to whom *the Heathens sacrific'd* and believ'd to reside in the *Idols* were endued with *real Power*, and had an *Influence* upon their Worshipers. For, if He does not assert this, He says nothing to support

support the Difference He affirms to be between one and the other.

THIS then being evident, it is necessary to understand the Apostle's Argument in such a manner, as to make *this Difference of Power*, which the *Devils* are here said to have above *Idols*, a Part of the Argument, and a Reason for the Conclusion He is drawing. Now if the Argument is to be understood as you have explain'd it, we have seen already, that the Words under Consideration are quite foreign to it, and that no Reason can be given, why they are brought in. And I believe every other Experiment to make these Words a *just* Part of the Argument, will be found as *fruitless* as yours has been, that does not suppose the Apostle's Design to be to shew not only the *Absurdity* of this Practice of the *Corinthians*, but the *Danger* of it also to those who were guilty of it, by their being thereby made Subject to the *Power* and the *Influences* of the Devil

It was an universal Notion, that there was an *Intercourse* always subsisting between  
the

the *Worshippers* and the *Object* worshipped; And that the *Rites* of worship, particularly *Sacrifices*, were the *Means* and *Instruments* whereby the *Influences* were convey'd from one to the other. When *Devils* therefore were the *Objects* worship'd, the *Influences* from them deriv'd to their *Votaries* must of necessity be *pestilent* and *fatal*.

AND for this Reason it was justly supposed, that they who *eat of the Sacrifices* that had been offer'd to them, were greatly *polluted* and *defiled* thereby, and made Subject to the *Devils Possessions*. And agreeably hereunto these *Sacrifices* are always called in the *Holy Scriptures* by some Name or other greatly importing *Pollution* and *Defilement*, and they are called by St. James at the Time of the making the *Apostolical Canon* concerning them, ἀλυσήματα τῶν εἰδώλων *Pollutions* of Idols \*. I think therefore that St. Paul who speaks of the *Devil* as the *Prince of the Power of the Air*, whose *Wiles* were to be continually *resisted* †, and as one whom God had suffered to ensnare Men and *take them Captive at his Will* ‡, may be well supposed

\* Acts 15. 20. † Eph. 2. 2. 6. 11 ‡ 2 Tim. 2. 26.



*to know*, that there was some *special* Enchantment in the *Heathen Sacrifices*, whereby the Partakers of them, were made Subject to the *Influences* of the Devil, and the Power of those *Charms* whereby the Credit of Idolatry was kept up in the World.

Now upon this Supposition the Argument of the Apostle will be found above any Thing that could be thought of, conducive to his Purpose of persuading the *Corinthians to flee from Idolatry*; in as much as He proves thereby, that the Practice He would dissuade them from, was not only dishonourable to God, and *of ill Consequence to others*, but fatally mischievous to *themselves* also, by subjecting them to the Malice and Tyranny of *Satan*.

AFTER this State of the Matter, I shall venture to give the following Representation of the Apostle's Argument for true.

“ *Dearly Beloved, flee from Idolatry* \* : I  
 “ will give you my Reason for this *Caution*  
 “ in what follows; consider what I say, and

\* 1 Cor. 10. 14.

“ I doubt not I shall convince you of the  
 “ Importance of the *Advice* ; for I know I  
 “ speak to Men who understand the Force  
 “ of an Argument\*. The *Idolatry* I speak  
 “ of, is the partaking with the *Heathens* in  
 “ their *Temples* of those *Sacrifices* that have  
 “ been offer’d to their *Idols*. All *Religious*  
 “ *Rites* whatsoever, are, in the very Nature  
 “ of them, supposed to be the Means of  
 “ procuring *Influences*, from the God that  
 “ is worship’d, upon his *Votaries*. You know,  
 “ we *Christians* by partaking of *Bread* and  
 “ *Wine* in the *Lord’s Supper*, have a *Fellow-*  
 “ *ship* in, or do jointly partake of the *Body*  
 “ and *Bloud* of Christ, in a Participation of  
 “ the *Benefits* procured for Mankind, by  
 “ his *Body Broken*, and his *Bloud shed* upon  
 “ the *Cross*†. For we being many are u-  
 “ nited together into one Society, and are  
 “ made joint Partakers of the same *Bread*  
 “ whereby we at once profess our selves to  
 “ be Disciples of the *same Lord*, and ac-  
 “ knowledge our Dependence upon *Him* as  
 “ upon our *Head*, and hope for a Share in  
 “ the *Benefits* and *Effects* of His *Passion*‡.  
 “ In like Manner the *Jews* partook of *their*

\* 1 Cor. 10. 15.

† V. 16.

‡ V. 17.

“ *Altar*, and of all the Expiations of it,  
 “ and receiv’d the *Benefits* of being in Co-  
 “ *venant* with God, by *eating Part* of the  
 “ *Sacrifices* \*. But you will be ready to  
 “ object, that if I mean to apply this to the  
 “ Case of *eating of the Heathen Sacrifices*,  
 “ the Case does not seem parallel, for that  
 “ an Idol is *nothing* as to any *Power* or *In-*  
 “ *fluence* it can have upon those who wor-  
 “ ship before it, nor can it any Way *pol-*  
 “ *lute* the *Sacrifices*, and make them *hurt-*  
 “ *ful* to the *eat*ers of them †. To this I an-  
 “ swer, that the *Impotence* of the *Idol* is no  
 “ Proof of your not receiving hurtful *In-*  
 “ *fluences* from the *Sacrifices* offer’d to it,  
 “ when you partake of them : For tho’ I-  
 “ dols are indeed as nothing, yet the *Devils*  
 “ residing in them, to whom the *Sacrifices*  
 “ are really offer’d, are Beings endued with  
 “ great *Power*, and *Malice* too, *they* have  
 “ by various *Arts* and *Delusions* estrang’d al-  
 “ most the whole *Heathen World* from the  
 “ Worship of the *true God*, for the Punish-  
 “ ment of which *Apostacy*, God has permit-  
 “ ted *them* to use great *Tyranny* over the  
 “ Minds and Bodies of their *Worshippers*.

\* Y. 18.

† V. 19.

“ I would not therefore that you should  
 “ have *Fellowship* and receive *Influences* from  
 “ such *malicious Spirits*, by your performing  
 “ such *Rites* as will give them a *Power* o-  
 “ ver you, and subject you to the Misery  
 “ of being continually liable to their *De-*  
 “ *lusions* \*. If you do thus, you will de-  
 “ stroy all the *good Effects* of your *Christian*  
 “ *Profession*. It will be to no Purpose of  
 “ *Benefit*, to drink of the *Lord's Cup*, and  
 “ to partake of the *Lord's Table*, if you  
 “ join in the *Gentile Ceremonies* of Religion,  
 “ and become *Subjects* of that *Kingdom* that  
 “ is set up in *Opposition* to *Christ's*, by  
 “ drinking of the *Cup of Devils*, and par-  
 “ taking of *their Table* †.

THE Argument for the Participation of  
 the *Benefits* of Christ's Death by a *Commu-*  
*nion of His Body* and *Bloud* in the Eucharist,  
 grounded upon this Passage stands thus,  
 with which I shall for the present conclude.

THEY who join'd with the *Heathens* in  
 eating of their *Idolatrous Sacrifices* made them-  
 selves subject to all that *Power* and *Influence*

\* V. 20.

† V. 21.

that

that *the Devils* had over their *Worshippers*; They who being *Jews* perform'd the Precepts of their Law, and did also *eat* of *their Peace-Offerings*, were thereby intituled to the *Benefits* and Expiations of *their Altar*: In like Manner, all serious and devout *Christians* who duly partake of the *Lord's Supper* are admitted to a *Share* in the *Expiations* and *Benefits* of *Christ's Death* commemorated therein.





## A D D E N D A.

P<sup>A</sup> 6. 34. l. 13. *after* multitude *add* ——— And unless it be in an Instance or two where the Word *εὐλογεῖν* is used to express the Action of *Blessing* in general, and where if any particular Object had been mention'd, the Sense of the Word would have been restrain'd beyond the manifest Purpose and Design of the *Holy Writer*.

P. 38. l. 12. *dele* Teste Grotio & *add* ——— According to *Grotius's* Sense of a Passage in *Josephus*, where He is speaking of the *Essenes*, which Passage is this ——— Περὶ κατ' ἐξουσίαν ὁ ἱερὸς τῆς τρεφῆς, καὶ μυσταδαί πνα πρὶν τῆς ἐσχ' ἡδύμην. ἀεὶ καταπαύσασθαι ἐπιούχεται πάλιν ἀρχόμενοι πρὶ παυόμενοι μαρτυρεῖται τὸν Θεὸν ὡς χορηγὸν τῆς τρεφῆς. *Grot. in Matth. 26. 26. Joseph. Hist. de Bello Jud. Lib. 2. Cap. 8. Sect. 5. Pag. 1061. Edit. Hudson.*

P. 61. l. 15. *after* Memorials to Him *add* ——— Under the Notion of presenting and laying the same before Him.

P. 80. *between the Lines 13 and 14 insert these Words* ——— It is the Apostle's Design only to shew that ———

## E R R A T A.

P<sup>A</sup> 6. 4. l. 17. *read* God's good Will.

P. 8. l. 20. *after* Pledge *put a Mark of Interrogation.*

P. 11. l. 9. *read* what has been.

P. 35. l. 2. *read* without.

P. 37. l. 10. *read* Eucharistical and Precatory.

P. 53. l. 22. *read* Words.

[illegible][illegible]

Q. 1

AN  
ANSWER

To a BOOK Intituled

*A plain Account of the Nature and  
End of the*

SACRAMENT &c.

---

PART II.

---



A N  
A N S W E R

To a BOOK Intituled

*A plain Account of the Nature and  
End of the*

SACRAMENT

O F T H E

LORD'S SUPPER.

In a Letter to the A U T H O R.

---

P A R T II.

---

By RICHARD WARREN D.D. Rector  
of CAVENDISH in SUFFOLK, and late Fel-  
low of JESUS College in CAMBRIDGE.

---

C A M B R I D G E

Printed for W. THURLBOURN.

And Sold by Messrs. Innes and Manby, S. Birt,  
Charles Rivington, and F. Clay Bookfellers in  
London. M, DCC, XXXVI.



A N S W E R

To a BOOK

A plain Account of the Nature and  
End of the

SACRAMENT

OF THE

LORD'S SUPPER



In a Letter

PART II.

By RICHARD WARREN D.D. Rector  
of CAVENTISH in SUFFOLK and late Fel-  
low of JESUS College in CAMBRIDGE.

CAMBRIDGE

Printed for W. THURLBURN.

And sold by Messrs. Jany and Mandy, 2. New  
Church Alley, and R. Clay Booksellers in  
London. M.DCC.XXXVI.



SIR,

I CONCLUDED the First Part of my Answer with a *Paraphrase* upon the famous Passage in the 10th Chapter of the 1 Cor. from the 16th to the 21st Verse. And with a State of the Argument for the Participation of Spiritual Benefits in the *Lord's Supper*, founded upon the same. I left you in your 47th Page without taking any Notice of your *Comments* upon that *Passage*, which extend to the close of your 59th Page. I shou'd now begin with taking those *Comments* into Consideration; but forasmuch as they only contain Reasons against admitting the Supposition of there being either *Sacrifice*, *Offering* or Altar in the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, I shall say but little concerning  
A them.

them : Because as I have no Design to debate with you upon those Points, lest it shou'd occasion a Digression from the main Design of my Answer ; so, if I had thought them of never so great Importance, to be clear'd and defended, I am sav'd the Trouble of doing it by the acute and learned Answers that have lately been given by several able and worthy Men, to all the Suggestions and Arguments of these last mention'd Pages.

I SHALL therefore pass them all over ; only I cannot but take Notice, that there is something very odd and singular in your directing all your Arguments against a real *Sacrifice, Offering, and Altar* to the *Romanists*, as if *they* were the only *Christians*, who have any Notion of them, at the same time that it is notorious, that all those Particulars have been, and are maintain'd, by many Persons of great Distinction for Learning among Protestants, and when it is also certain that they are, when rightly understood, reconcilable to the *Articles* and *Liturgy* of our Church. And I cannot but observe also, that you strangely misrepresent the Matter, when you  
affirm

affirm afterwards, that the Absurdity of supposing a Sacrifice of the very *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ in the *Lord's Supper*, is the only *Ground* for any *Notion* of an *Altar* in this *Rite* \*; forasmuch as those *Protestants* who maintain the Reality of an *Altar* and a *Sacrifice*, and who yet utterly disown the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, have more to say for themselves, in Justification of their *Notions* herein, than you, or any one else will ever be able to answer upon your Principles.

AFTER near 30 Pages spent in *Paraphrase* and Comments upon these six Verses of St. Paul, you draw the following *Proposition* from the whole.

XI. *Christians* meeting together for Religious Worship and eating *Bread* and drinking *Wine* in Remembrance of Christ's *Body* and *Bloud*, and in honour to Him, do hereby publicly acknowledge Him to be their Master, and themselves to be his Disciples, and by doing this in an *Assembly*, own themselves, with all other *Chri-*

\* Pag. 57.

A 2

*stians,*

*stians, to be one BODY or Society under Him the HEAD, and consequently, profess themselves to be under his Governance and Influence, to have Communion or Fellowship with HIM, as HEAD, and with all their Christian Brethren, as FELLOW MEMBERS of that same BODY of which He is the HEAD.*

*IN your Comment upon this Proposition you are so good as to own, that all this flows even from the Primary End of the Institution, The Remembrance of our Lord\*.*

*THIS and much more does doubtless follow from the Words of the Institution. But why was not your Reader made acquainted with this in the proper Place? when you was setting before Him in your 8th and 9th Propositions, what appear'd to you to be the full Import and Design of the Words of the Institution, you ought to have produc'd every Thing that was plainly express'd, or necessarily imply'd in them.*



BUT your Head ran so much upon what you call the *plainness* and *simplicity* of the *Institution*, that you cou'd then see nothing more in it, than that *Bread* was to be *eaten*, and *Wine* drunk in *Remembrance* of *Christ* our *Master* consider'd as corporally absent from us\*.

I BELIEVE there were very few of your Readers who were not startled at so cold and jejune a Representation of the Sense of those so *solemn* and *awful* Words. And I think you cou'd not your self have given it, if you had not *first* resolv'd upon your *Scheme*, and *then* look'd out for such Interpretations of Scripture, as might best serve to establish it.

BUT, whether upon farther Recollection, or for what other Reason I know not, you are now willing to own, that what you acknowledge to be the Import of St. Paul's Words in this *Passage* concerning the *Communion* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* in the *Lord's Supper*, is also included in that very *Remembrance* which you represent as the *End* of the *Institution* †.

\* Prop. 8. 9.

† Pag. 58.

BUT

BUT I wou'd by no Means have your Readers think they get a great deal by this *Concession*. The Amount of all is only this; That by a joint Participation of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, *Christians* acknowledge themselves *Members* of that *Body* of which He is the *Head*, and that they are thereby oblig'd to all the *Duties*, and intituled, (unless they are wanting to themselves in any one necessary Point) to all the *Blessings* of such a *Relation* \*. So that after all, this is no more than a *Token* of our believing *Christ* to be our *Master*: It is no *Pledge* or *Security* of any *Benefits* to be receiv'd by our *Fellowship* with Him and our *Dependence* upon Him. And how specious soever the *Appearance* was, of some Kind of *Advantage* arising from this *Communion*, it is, upon *Inquiry*, all dwindled into a mere *Mark* of our *Profession*, and it has no other Effect, than the declaring ourselves to be *Christians*.

BEFORE I proceed to give the true and just Purport and Design of the Words of the Institution, and of this Passage, according to what has been prov'd by me in the

\* Pag. 59.

former Part, in order fully to clear my Way to it, I think it proper to take Notice of, and give an Answer to what has been objected to the following Sentence in the 75<sup>th</sup> Page of Part I.

THAT *the Word, Δαιμόνια, is always used in the New Testament, without one Exception to the contrary, to signify wicked Spirits, the Devil and his Angels.*

A FRIENDLY Gentleman, to me unknown, has in an *Anonymous* Letter very obligingly hinted to me his Fears, lest this Assertion shou'd be found to have been made in too general Terms; Because, "The Words — *Acts* 17. 18. *Ξένων δαιμό-  
νίων καταγελῆς* cannot possibly be taken  
" in any other Sense than a Publisher or  
" setter forth of strange Gods or *Demons*;  
" And that the *Διδασκαλία Δαιμονίαν* spo-  
" ken of *1 Tim.* 4. 1. ought more agree-  
" ably to the Apostle's Argument, to be  
" render'd Doctrines of *Demons* or *inferior  
Deities*, than *Devils*. Now it must be  
own'd that the *ξένα δαιμόνια* mention'd in  
the first Passage, are certainly those *Beings*  
which the *Heathens* worshipped under the  
Notion of *inferior Deities*; and that they did  
not

not look upon them as *evil* and *malignant Beings*: But it must at the same Time be remember'd, that they who use these Words in this Place, were *Heathens*, — *Certain Philosophers of the Epicureans and the Stoicks*, and that they are not the Words either of *St. Paul*, or of the Historian *St. Luke*, and so, tho' found indeed in the New Testament, do not shew the Sense the Sacred Writers had of the Word, any more than what the same *Philosophers* said at the same Time of *St. Paul*, that He was a *Babler* [σπερμολόγος] is to be charg'd as the Sense of the *Historian* concerning Him. It may therefore, notwithstanding this, be most certainly true, that all the Sacred Writers always understand the Word Δαιμόνιον, and Δαιμόνι in a bad Sense.

As to the other Passage, if it shou'd be also allow'd, that the Apostle is speaking in those Words [Διδασκαλίαις Δαιμονίων] of the Heathen Doctrines concerning *Demons*; viz. That they were to be worshipp'd as inferior *Deities* or Mediators, and so speaking of their Notion, used the Word, as He ought to do, in their Sense of it; yet this

this is no Manner of Proof, that He thought otherwise Himself of them than as of *wicked Spirits, the Devil and his Angels*. And the learned Mr. *Mede* \* in his Discourse upon this Subject, tho' He labours hard to shew, that the Apostle does here use the Word *Δαιμόνια* in the Heathen Sense of it, yet does himself affirm expressly, “ That “ because those which the Gentiles took “ for *Demons*, and for Deify'd Souls of their “ *Worthies*, were indeed no other than *Evil* “ *Spirits*, counterfeiting the Souls of Men “ deceas'd, and masking themselves under “ the Names of such suppos'd *Demons*, under that Colour to seduce Mankind; “ therefore the *Scripture* useth the Name “ *Demons* for that they were indeed, and “ not for what they seem'd to be.” When I therefore say, that the Word *Δαιμόνια* is always used in the New Testament to signify *The Devil and his Angels*, I ought to be understood to mean, what I profess to be my Meaning, *that this is the Sense of the Word in which the Sacred Writers themselves do always understand it.* Having thus explain'd my self upon this Point, I proceed

\* *Mede's Works* p. 635.



in Opposition to your Paraphrase and Comment, to give the true Purport and Doctrine both of the Words of the *Institution*, and of the Passage of *St. Paul* before mention'd, in the following Proposition.

THAT the Lord's Supper is an Ordinance appointed by Christ Himself as a Means of Worship, and of obtaining God's Favour; particularly, that the *Bread* and *Wine* being by a solemn *Invocation* of the *Divine Blessing* upon them, made the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, in the Sense of representing the same, do become the Means of conveying to the *worthy* Receivers thereof, the *Benefits* of his Passion, whereby the *Pardon of Sin*, the Assistance of the *blessed Spirit of God* and *eternal Life* are confirm'd and ensur'd to them, upon their Observation of the Terms requir'd on their Part by the *Covenant* of God in *Christ*; and that the Observation of this Holy Ordinance, is that *Communion of Christ's Body and Bloud*, whereby *Christians* hold *intercourse* with, and receive Influences from *Christ* their *Head*, and are made Partakers as from a *Common Stock*, of their Proportion of all the *Blessings* and

Expia

*Expiations purchas'd by the infinite Merit of his Death and Sufferings.*

I COME now to the next *Passage* you mention, 1 Cor. 11. v. 20. ——— 34.

V. 20. *When ye come together therefore into one Place, THIS is not to eat the Lord's Supper.*

21. *For in eating, every one taketh before OTHER his own Supper, and one is hungry, and another is drunken.*

22. *What? have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.*

23. *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I deliver'd unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same Night in which He was betray'd, took Bread;*

24. *And when He had given Thanks, He brake IT, and said, take eat; this is my Body which is broken for you; This do in Remembrance of me.*

25. *After the same Manner also He took the Cup, when He had supped, saying, this*

Cup is the New Testament in my Bloud: This do ye, as oft as ye drink IT, in Remembrance of me.

26. For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till He come.

27. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat THIS Bread, and drink THIS Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Bloud of the Lord.

28. But let a Man examine himself, and so let Him eat of THAT Bread and drink of THAT Cup.

29. For He that eateth and drinketh UNWORTHILY, eateth and drinketh Damnation to Himself, not discerning the Lord's Body.

30. For this Cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

31. For if we wou'd judge ourselves, we should not be judged.

32. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the World.

33. Wherefore, my Brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another.

34. And

34. *And if any Man hunger, let Him eat at Home; that ye come not together unto Condemnation.* —

You have spread eleven of these short *Verses* over almost as many *Pages* of your Book, by a very long *Paraphrase* upon plain Words. But when Words are to be forc'd to a Meaning they do not naturally bear, and to be *tortur'd* into the *Confession* of something that the Writer never had in his View; as more *Art* is necessary, so more Words must be used, to gloss over the Reasoning, and give it a fair Appearance. But however you have *disguised* the *Apostle's* true Design of this *Passage*, I hope, I shall, by Degrees *clear* it up to the Reader, and shew, not only that it does not *serve* your *Hypothesis*, but that it plainly and necessarily overthrows it. In order to this I must lay before Him the Substance and Purport of your *Paraphrase*, which may thus be truly, tho' in fewer Words, represented.

“ WHEN you come together to eat  
 “ and drink in Remembrance of your Master,  
 “ and

“ and behave your selves indecently, this  
 “ is not to *eat the Lord's Supper*, as it ought  
 “ to be eaten. For many of you behave  
 “ your selves as eating your own Suppers  
 “ to indulge your Appetites. Those who  
 “ are able to provide plentifully, eating at  
 “ that Feast to which you join the Lord's  
 “ Supper, without waiting for their poor  
 “ Brethren; and so one is hungry, and a-  
 “ nother feasts beyond due Bounds. Have  
 “ ye not Houses for your ordinary eating  
 “ and drinking? Or, have ye no Sense that  
 “ ye come together for the Religious Pur-  
 “ pose of eating and drinking in Remem-  
 “ brance of your Master? Do ye thus de-  
 “ spise the Church of God, and shame  
 “ your poor Brethren by a Behaviour that  
 “ insults their hunger. I cannot praise you  
 “ for this. On the contrary I condemn  
 “ you as acting inconsistently with the *Ori-*  
 “ *ginal Institution* of this Holy Rite. An  
 “ Account of which I will now lay before  
 “ you.” After the Apostle had done this  
 in the 23<sup>d</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> Verses, you say, He  
 argues from the *Institution* in this Man-  
 ner of eating together

“ I t



" It is plain from the *Institution* that  
 " the Design of your meeting to eat THIS  
 " Bread and drink THIS Wine is for the se-  
 " rious Purpose of shewing forth the Death  
 " of Christ, 'till He shall *return in Glory*.  
 " Hence it follows, that every one who in-  
 " stead of this, behaves Himself as at a Com-  
 " mon Meal, even without observing the  
 " Rules of Temperance, is guilty of an In-  
 " dignity against the *Body and Blood of Christ*.  
 " On the contrary, let every one examine  
 " Himself, or approve Himself to his own  
 " Conscience, as regarding the Design of  
 " the Lord's Supper, and let Him eat and  
 " drink so, or in such a Manner, as be-  
 " comes that Design. For if He performs  
 " this Duty in a Manner unworthy of the  
 " *Institution*, not considering the Bread as  
 " the Memorial of Christ's Body, not mak-  
 " ing a sufficient Difference between this  
 " Bread and an intemperate Meal, He is  
 " guilty of a great Offence, and is liable  
 " to God's just Displeasure. This you may  
 " your selves see from the Effects of *this*  
 " Intemperance. For you have impair'd  
 " the Health of your Bodies : Sicknes and  
 " even Death are come among you. But  
 " if

“ if we wou’d call our selves to Account,  
 “ and amend what is evil in us, we shou’d  
 “ not be thus punish’d by God here, and  
 “ shou’d not be finally condemn’d with the  
 “ Wicked. Wherefore, my Brethren, when  
 “ you are to meet together at the Lord’s  
 “ Table, wait for one another, ’till a good  
 “ Number be assembled, and then perform  
 “ this Religious Rite with all Decency.  
 “ But if any of you propose to eat to sa-  
 “ tisfy Hunger, do it at home, this is not  
 “ the Place for it.”

Now as easy and natural as this *Para-*  
*phrase* may seem to be, and with how much  
 Assurance soever you may give it for a just  
 Representation of the Apostle’s Sense; I  
 think, if all the Errors in it of every Kind  
 are number’d, they will not fall much short  
 of the Number of Sentences in it. For

I. FIRST, you without any Manner of  
 Ground or Probability, suppose the *Corin-*  
*thians* to be charg’d here by the Apostle as  
 ignorant of the very Design of their com-  
 ing together, even so as not to consider  
 that the *Lord’s Supper* differ’d from a Com-  
 mon

mon Meal; and that He repeated to them the Words of the *Institution* to remind 'em of the true Nature and Design of it \*.

1. Now how is it possible, that Persons with whom the Apostle had liv'd near two Years when He first preach'd the Gospel among them †, whereby they had an Opportunity of being fully instructed in all the Mysteries of the Religion they had embrac'd, and of whom He does Himself in the Beginning of this very Epistle, speak such extraordinary Things with Regard to their Gifts and Excellencies as to bear Testimony for them, that they *were enriched by God, in all Utterance, and in all Knowledge, so that they came behind in no Gift ‡*. How, I say, is it possible to imagine, that any among these shou'd be so destitute of the knowledge of the first *Elements of Christianity*, as not to apprehend, or indeed as not ever to carry in their Minds the Difference of the *Lord's* from a *Common Supper*, and not consider that the Design of their meeting together was to worship God, by a thank-

\* Pag. 61, 62, 67.

† *Act*. 13. 11, 18.

‡ 1 *Cor*. 1. 5, 7.

ful Remembrance of the Death and Sufferings of his only Son for their Sakes? Any Absurdity may as soon be believ'd as this, that Persons so *well instructed* shou'd either be ignorant of, or not attend to the Design of the very *Principal Part* of the Christian Worship; and that the frequency of their meeting together, and the *important End* thereof, should not quicken their Apprehensions at least to such a Degree, that it might not with Truth be said of them, as was of *Demetrius's* tumultuous Assembly at *Ephesus*, that *the more Part knew not wherefore they were come together* \*.

WHAT farther shews the grossness of this Supposition is, that these very Persons, whom you now suppose so very stupid, were honour'd in the foregoing Chapter with the Title of *Wise Men*, and were apply'd to as Judges of Reason and Argument, and what is still a great deal more to the present Purpose, were apply'd to as Judges of an Argument, one Member of which was the very Point of which they are by you supposed to be ignorant.

\* *Acts* 19. 31.

FOR the Apostle asks them as Persons well acquainted with the Matter; *The Cup of Blessing*, says He, *which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Bloud of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ* \*? The Subject Matter of these Questions is here supposed by the *Apostle* to be so well known to the *Corinthians*, that He uses the same as an evident Principle, by the Force of which He would make them sensible of another Point not so plain, that He was proving to them.

EITHER therefore you must charge the *Apostle* with some Degree of Inconsistency in this Case (which I hope, you have a greater Regard to the Truth and Certainty of *Scripture*, than to do) or you must give up your Charge of Ignorance against the *Corinthians*, concerning the Nature and Design of the *Lord's Supper*, and then the main Ground of your Argument from this Passage will be destroy'd. I shall leave you to try to get rid of this *Difficulty*, in such Manner as you like best, but shall for my self

\* 1 Cor. 10. 16,



securely conclude, that a Supposition that is press'd *with it*, cannot be true.

BUT this is not the only *Difficulty* that attends this Supposition. For

2. WE have, very unfortunately for you, our Apostle's own Word and express Declaration against it, and that too in this very Chapter. For, at the second Verse He says Ἐπαινῶ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πάντα μὴ μέμνησθε, καὶ καθὼς παρεδώκα ὑμῖν τὰς Παραδόσεις ΚΑΤΕΧΕΤΕ \*. Now I praise you Brethren, that you remember me in all Things, and keep, [κατέχετε] hold fast, firmly retain the Ordinances as, [καθὼς] just as, I deliver'd them into you.

IF there could have been any doubt, whether one of the Ordinances of which the Apostle here speaks, was that concerning the Participation of the Lord's Supper in Remembrance of Christ, He has himself remov'd it, by telling the Corinthians, at the 23d Verse, that He had deliver'd unto them the very Account of that Ordinance, which He had Himself receiv'd from Christ. Ἐγὼ γάρ

\* 1 Cor. 11. 2.

παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου ὃ καὶ ΠΑΡΕΔΩΚΑ  
ὑμῖν \*.

Is it then possible that He should praise them at the *2d Verse*, for retaining and holding fast the *Ordinances* as He had *delivered them*, and shou'd moreover say at the *23d Verse* that *one* of those *Ordinances* was that concerning the *Manner* of celebrating the *Lord's Supper*, and yet shou'd dispraise them at the *17th Verse* for having so far forgotten what He had thus *deliver'd unto them*, or so little attended to it, as to need a Repetition of the Words of the *Institution*, to remind them how the *Ordinance* was to be perform'd? Could the *Apostle* do this, with any *Manner* of *Consistency*? Is not the very *Supposition* of it, a manifest *Charge* upon Him of such a *Degree* of *Infirmity* and *Forgetfulness* as wou'd destroy the *Authority* of all He says upon the *Occasion*? But *God* forbid, that any *Thing* shou'd be admitted as true, that is attended with such a *Consequence*. And I think there can be no better *Argument* of the *falseness* of any *Scheme*, than that it stands in need of being

ing supported by a Supposition, which to me appears so full of *profane Absurdity*.

II. SECONDLY, in order to strengthen your Conclusions from this *Passage*, you without Ground suppose, that great Part of the Guilt of the *Corinthians* consisted in joining the Lord's Supper to a *Feast*, wherein they behav'd themselves *disorderly*, and eat and drank with *Intemperance*, and Excess. Now this Charge upon them is *injurious*. There is nothing that could lead you to make it, but these Words — *Καὶ ὅς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὅς δὲ μεθύει*; Which our Translators have render'd, and *one is hungry, and another is drunken*. But now these Words in the *Original*, when duly consider'd, will appear to imply no such *odious* Matter, as you, led away perhaps by the Translation, have fix'd upon them.

THE Words *μεθύει*, and *μεθύεται*, altho' they frequently import the being intoxicated with Liquor; yet they likewise often signify the being affected with it to a Degree of *Cheerfulness* only, and *innocent Mirth*. They have this Meaning several Times

Times in the Septuagint\*. And ἔταν μεθύωσι has doubtless the same innocent Meaning in the Account of our Saviour's miraculously turning Water into Wine; where our *Translators* render it, *when Men have well drunken*†. The Lexicographers also explain the Word μεθύσκεσθαι by πληγεῖσθαι, as it certainly often signifies no more than the having drunk so as to be *satisfy'd*‡. And it is observable that the Word μέθη is used by the *Seventy* with Regard to *drinking* in the self same Sense in which πλησμονή is used in the same Place of the Prophet *Haggai*, and both in the precise Sense of *fulness* only, and not *Riot* or *Excess*||. This use of the Word μεθύσκεσθαι is confirm'd also by Profane Authors, par-

\* Gen. 43. 34. Ἐπειον δὲ, καὶ ἐμεθύοντο μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Cant. 5. 1. Πίσι, καὶ μεθύοντι ἀδελφοί.

And Jerem. 31. 14, 25. The Word is used actively to the same Meaning. Καὶ μεθύσων τὴν ψυχὴν ἡ ἱερὴν ἡμῶν Λευί. — Ὅτι ἐμέδυσσε πᾶσαν ψυχὴν διψῶσαν, καὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν πεινῶσαν ἐνέπλησε.

† Job. 2. 10.

‡ Hesych. Μεθύει, πιπλήρωται. Μεθύσκομαι, πληρῶμαι.  
p. 626. Lugd. Bat.

Phavorin. p. 1223. Basf. 1538.

|| Haggai 1. 6. — ἰφάγει καὶ σὺν εἰς πλησμονήν, ἐπίει καὶ σὺν εἰς μέθυ —

ticularly by *Herodotus*, who when He is speaking of the Custom of the ancient *Persians* of deliberating upon the weighty Affairs of State, as well when they were full as fasting, plainly uses the Word *μεθύσασθαι* in the Sense of their having drunk to a Degree of Courage and Cheerfulness only, and not disorder \*.

BUT *St. Paul* has Himself acquainted us, that this is a just and usual Meaning of the Word, by adding a Word to it in order to fix the Sense of it to a Signification of Intemperance or Excess. So *Eph. 5. 18.* Καὶ μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνω, ὃ ὡς ἐστὶν ἀσωπία — And be ye not fill'd with Wine to a Degree of Excess — And there is something particular also in this Place under Consideration, why the Word *μεθύειν* should be taken in an innocent Meaning, and that is the Opposition that is here made between this Word and *πεινᾶν*. For as one imports a want of Sustenance, the other can naturally signify no more, than the being sustain'd

\* *Μεθύσασθαι* ἢ ἰώθαι βελούει τὰ ἀσώπια καὶ πρὸς ἡμέραν; τὸ δ' ἀν' αὐτῇ σφί βελουμένοις, τῷ τῇ ὑπερβαίῃ νόσῳ ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ εἰσάρχος — *Herod. Elia 133. p. 57. Gale.*



to a Degree of Fulness and Sufficiency. From all which put together it is very plain, that the Word ought to be so understood here, if there are no attending Circumstances that forbid it. But certainly there are no such Circumstances here: for the Persons whom the Apostle reproves for their Manner of holding this *Feast*, were those of whom He spake so many *good Things* before, that it is not reasonable to suppose them capable of such a Disorder just before the Time of celebrating the Lord's Supper, as taking the Word in the Criminal Sense will fix upon them. Wherefore since you have presum'd to do this in an arbitrary Manner even against all just Rules of Interpretation, it is evident, that all you have built upon it can be of no real Service to your Cause. But I have not yet done with this Point. For I observe again

III. THIRDLY, that you are not content to charge Intemperance upon the *Corinthians* from your forc'd Interpretation of the Words already consider'd; but in order to make the same as excessive as possible, even beyond all Reason and Probability,

D

you

you insert a Conjecture into your *Paraphrase* upon the 30th Verse\*, a mere *Invention* of your own, and pass it upon your Readers for the Sense of Part of the *Text*. For you make the Apostle declare that the Sickness and Death that then raged among the *Corinthians*, were the *Effects* of THIS *Intemperance*, and that they had THEMSELVES impair'd the Health of their Bodies. Now this is little less than adding your own Conjecture to the Word of God, the more effectually to impose upon your Readers. For most certainly the Apostle wholly and solely ascribes those Calamities to the *just Judgment of God* for their Sins, without any the least Intimation of their suffering them as the *natural Effects* of their Intemperance. And you are the more culpable for doing this; because as this Degree of Excess you charge upon them, has no Foundation in those Parts of this Passage already consider'd; so the Supposition of it is inconsistent with the Conclusion of this Passage, and with the Conclusion of his Second *Epistle*. He concludes this Passage with these Words, *Wherefore my beloved Brethren, when*

\* Pag. 67.

*ye come together to eat, tarry one for another ; and if any Man hunger let Him eat at home.*

HERE the *Apostle* repeats the Particulars which He had before charg'd as Indecencies of which they were guilty *when they came together to eat* ; and concludes with an Exhortation to avoid them for the future.

AND what are these Particulars? why only these two: First, that *when they came together to eat*, they should *tarry for one another*. And then that they should not eat to satisfy *hunger*, but that He that was *hungry*, should *eat at home*. Here is nothing of *Gluttony* or *Drunkenness* mention'd, nor imply'd: All that He warns them to do, was to tarry till the whole Company was assembled, before they sat down *to eat*, and to do it *sparingly*, when they did *eat*. So that by reforming themselves in these *two Points*, they would clear themselves of all the Guilt charg'd upon them before, concerning the *Manner* of their *eating*.

AND that it could be no *criminal Excess* in eating and drinking, that He before accused

cused them of, is still farther plain from these *concluding* Words; because what He had at the Beginning of his Discourse censured them for doing when assembled for the *worship of God*, He permits at any other Time and Place; *If any Man hunger let Him eat at home*; Which He could not have done, if what He condemns as done in the *Church*, had not been innocent elsewhere.

BUT, as I said this Charge of *Intemperance* is still farther groundless and unreasonable, because as the Apostle never accuses them of *this* Vice, in any other Part of either of his Epistles to them, so He omits doing it, towards the End of his *Second*, when, in order to make the greater *Impression* upon them, and the more effectually to work a Reformation among 'em of what was amiss, He concludes with a Catalogue of the Vices to which they were Subject\*: For it is not to be conceiv'd that He cou'd have omitted the mention of this among the rest, if it really had been a Vice, to which they were so much addicted,

\* 2 Cor. 12. 21, 22.)

ed, as not to forbear it even in their *Religious Assemblies*, and especially if they were guilty of it to such an enormous Degree too, as to have brought Diseases and Death upon themselves thereby, as you say they had.

FROM all which Reasons united, it is plain, that you have injur'd both the *Corinthians* and your *Readers*; The *Corinthians*, by loading them with the Imputation of a Crime, of which there is no Reason to believe that they were guilty; and your *Readers*, by endeavouring to seduce them *thereby*, into your wild Opinion concerning the Nature and Kind of the *Examination* here requir'd.

IV. FOURTHLY, you confound the Manner of the *Corinthians* performing their *Love-Feasts* with that of their celebrating the *Lord's Supper*, as if it was all one and the same Action: And so you ascribe the Indecency of their *taking every one before other their own Supper*, and their *eating* it in the Church to satisfy their *hunger*, as an Indecency in the Act of partaking of the *Lord's*



*Lord's Supper*, when it was plainly an unbecoming Way, of performing a Thing of quite another Nature. For if the indecent *eating* and *drinking* here spoken of, did immediately relate to the *Lord's Supper*; then they must be supposed to have receiv'd the same, every Man by Himself, without staying for one another, till the whole Church was assembled, contrary to the Practice of all Churches, to the Reason and Design of their meeting together, and even to common Sense. Here then you have again made an absurd Supposition, the better to serve your *Hypothesis*.

V. FIFTHLY, you make a very unfair Representation of the Meaning of the Apostle in your *Paraphrase* and *Comments* upon the 28th Verse, concerning the *Examination* there commanded. Your *Paraphrase* is this; " Let every one of you examine  
 " himself, enter into and try himself, by  
 " considering the Original *Institution* of this  
 " Rite, and by that *Examination* let Him be  
 " led to perform these Actions of *eating*  
 " and *drinking* SO, that is, in *such* a Manner, as is plainly imply'd in the Nature  
 " of

" of that *Institution* it self." You explain  
 this by adding, that " the Words do not ap-  
 pear to you to signify, " Let a Man exa-  
 mine himself, and then let Him eat," as  
 " they seem to do at first reading in *English*:  
 " But, let a Man examine himself, and let  
 " him eat SO, or in such a Manner, as is  
 " here laid down, *viz.* a Manner suitable to  
 " the *Institution*;" That is, (as you farther ex-  
 plain your self in your 12th Proposition \*)  
 " in order to assure himself, that He comes  
 " to the *Lord's Supper*, not as to a Common  
 " Meal, but in order to *eat Bread and drink*  
 " *Wine* in a *serious Remembrance of Christ*,  
 " and his *Death*." For a Confirmation of  
 this, you observe still farther, that " The  
 " Word *ἕως*, SO, join'd to *and*, often sig-  
 " nifies, *in this Manner*, in many other Pla-  
 " ces; and that it appears to do so here,  
 " particularly from the Connexion of this  
 " with the following Verse, which begins  
 " with *For*, and gives a Reason for the Di-  
 " rection laid down in this Verse. Which  
 " Reason will have the less Force, if the  
 " Meaning of SO, in the foregoing Verse,

\* Pag. 71.

“ be not in such a Manner, as is suitable  
 “ to the *Institution*.”

Now here I think you have taken great Pains, and used much Subtilty, with no other Effect, but to perplex a very plain *Text* with an obscure *Paraphrase*. But your Success is however full as good as your Design, which is to mislead uncautious *Readers* into an Opinion, that the Examination requir'd is to regulate the actual Manner of performing the Duty only; and that it has no Regard to any *Preparation* whatsoever antecedent to the Time of receiving.

You say, it appears that *ὅτως* signifies in this Place, SO, or in such a Manner as is here laid down, viz. a Manner suitable to the *Institution*. Now, if it should be allow'd that *ὅτως*, even when join'd to καί, does in this Place, and generally signify, *in this Manner*; yet certainly, it neither signifies here, nor any where else, any other Manner, than what is plainly expressed by the Author, in the very Place where He uses the Word.

It has always a Relation to something immediately foregoing, and no other *Manner* can be meant, but what is distinctly, and immediately named. When St. Luke, in the close of his History of St. Paul's Shipwreck, says — Καὶ ὅτως ἐγένετο πάντας διασωθῆναι ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν — The Words are rightly interpreted, *And so, or in this Manner, it came to pass, that they escaped all safe to Land\**. But then the *Manner* in which this was done is very particularly express'd in the Words immediately foregoing — *The Centurion — commanded that they which could swim, should cast THEMSELVES first into the Sea, and get to Land: And the rest, some on Boards, and some on BROKEN PIECES of the Ship: And So, or in this Manner, it came to pass† —*

THE *Seventy* in their Translation of *Moses's* History of the Creation, join ὅτως to καὶ in six or seven different Places in the Sense of *thus*, or, *after this Manner‡*, but it is observable, that in every one of them, ὅτως is referr'd to the Words immediately

\* Acts 27. 44.

† Acts 27. 43. 44.

‡ Gen. 1.

foregoing; and this I believe, is universally the Case, wherever the Construction is to be, *after this Sort, or, in this Manner.* For which Reason it ought to be referr'd here also to the *Examination* immediately before mention'd. And if you will render *it* by the Words *In this Manner*, it must be in this Sense, Having examin'd or approv'd Himself to his own Conscience, *Let Him eat of this Bread, and drink of this Cup* \*. In which Sense ἔτως seems to be used Gal. 6. 2. Ἀλλήλων τὰ βάρη βαρύνετε, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἀναπληροῦσατε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. *Bear ye one anothers Burdens, and so, or in this Manner, fulfil the Law of Christ.*

IF indeed there had been any Thing in the immediately foregoing Verse to which *the Manner* of performing the *Examination* cou'd be referr'd, it would be tolerable to suppose the Words καὶ ἑαυτοὺς to relate to *that*: But there is nothing spoken of in the 27th Verse but *eating and drinking unworthily, and being guilty of the Body, and Bloud of the Lord.* So that all that is therein said, must be necessarily pass'd over. And to refer

\* Cor. 11. 28.

them,



them, as you do, to a Verse still farther backward, is against all Precedent and Use, and cannot be warranted by any Authority whatsoever.

BUT the "Connexion, you say, of this "with the *following Verse*, which begins "with FOR, and gives a Reason for the "Direction laid down in this Verse" shews that ἔτι must be understood as you understand it, because "the Reason will have the "less Force, if the meaning of SO, in the "foregoing Verse, be not *in such a Manner*, as is suitable to the *Institution* \*.

Now here just contrary to this, I cannot but think, that *the Reason given in the 29th Verse, for the Direction laid down in the 28th*, must have at least the very same Force whether εἰ ἔτι be referr'd to the *Examination* mention'd in *that Verse*, or to what is mention'd concerning the Design of the *Institution* in the *26th Verse*. For as the Guilt of *unworthy* receiving mention'd in the *27th Verse*, and the Punishment thereof mention'd in the *29th*, have both a great Force

\* Pag. 65.

to persuade Men to due Care in the discharge of *this Duty*; so do they give a most substantial Reason for the *Examination* propounded; since *it* is the very *Way* and *Means* whereby they may avoid the Guilt and Punishment of *unworthiness* in partaking of the *Lord's Supper*.

FOR the Argument is this — *Examine* your selves, and by that Means avoid the Imputation of being *guilty of the Body and Bloud of Christ*; for as the Crime of so doing is very great, so will be the *Punishment* also. FOR *He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to Himself*. You indeed suppose, contrary to Reason and Truth, (as shall afterwards be shewn) that the *Examination* only concerns the single Point, *whether a Man eats and drinks* in Remembrance of Christ, and with a present Disposition suitable thereunto. But now, if the *Examination* should be moreover suppos'd to concern the whole Frame and Disposition of the Heart, and to be requir'd to prevent a Man's coming to the *Lord's Supper* without *Repentance*, and a sincere Resolution of *Amendment*; is not the  
Danger

Danger of his coming in so unprepar'd a Manner, the very same, and is not the Reason of the Command for *Examination*, in order to his being able to *assure himself* that He does not only come *seriously*, but with *Repentance* also, at least as *cogent* as it can be upon your Supposition? The *eating* and *drinking* without a Man's having *examined* himself so as to *approve* his Behaviour to his own *Conscience*, is the Ground of the Guilt in *both* Cases, and the Punishment threat- en'd to the *eating* and *drinking* without such an *Approbation* alike enforces the Command in *both* Cases.

BUT after all, the Word *ἔως* whether join'd to *καὶ*, or not, is very often an *Ad-verb of Time*, as particularly *Rom. 11. 26.* Καὶ ἔως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται. *And so, or then, all Israel shall be saved. 1 Thess. 4. 17.* Καὶ ἔως πάντοτε σὺν Κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα. *And so, or then, shall we ever be with the Lord.* So likewise *Xenophon* uses it \* ——— προσωξάμφοι θεοῖς ——— ἔως διέβαινον τὰ ὅρια. *When they had pay'd their Devotions to their Gods ——— they THEN pass'd over the Bounds [of PERSIA.]*

\* *Xenoph. Κύρου παιδείας* Lib. 2. Cap. 1. Sect. 1. Ed. Oxon.  
There

There can be therefore no good Reason given, why it should not be taken in that Sense here: And so the Meaning of this *Text*, notwithstanding your critical Pains, will remain just the same as the generality of *Commentators* have understood it: And the Design of the Command will be this; that the *Corinthians*, and all *Christians* shou'd be careful to avoid the Guilt of *unworthiness* in partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, by first approving themselves to their own Consciences — *Let a Man examine himself, and so, or then, let Him eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup.*

UPON the whole therefore, I think this choice *Criticism* thrown away to very little Purpose. Indeed you have been so just as to inclose it within *Marks*, that usually denote, that what is contain'd within them, may either be *left out*, or *put in*; may as well be *pass'd over*, as *read*, for any real Use that it serves in the Argument; and in *this* you have dealt fairly by your *Readers* by thus admonishing them of the plain Truth of the Case.

VI. SIXTHLY, as I have before shewn your Presumption in inserting into your *Paraphrase*, and passing the same upon your Readers for the Sense of Part of this Passage of Scripture, what has no Manner of Foundation in the *Text*; so I shall now shew your *Artifice*, in removing from your Reader's View several *Verses*, which are as much a Part of the *Passage* you propose to examine, for their Instruction, upon the Subject of the *Lord's Supper*, as any of the *Verses* you do *Paraphrase* and explain. The *Verses* I mean are those which do immediately precede the *Verses* you have *Paraphrased*. 1. Cor. II. 17, 18, 19.

17. *Now in this, that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that you come together not for the better but for the worse.*

18. *For, first of all, when you come together in the Church, I hear that there be Divisions among you, and I partly believe it.*

19. *For there must be also Heresies among you that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.*

THAT these Words are introductory to what follows, and are a Part of what is design'd



sign'd by the *Apostle*, in Reproof of the *Corinthians*, for their *unworthy* Manner of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, is evident, as well from the obvious Sense of them, as from their Connexion with the Words that follow. Συναρχομένων ἐν ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ ——— When ye come together THEREFORE into one Place, this is not to eat the *Lord's Supper*. The Particle ἐν constrains us to understand these Words as relative to the foregoing: And what is affirm'd in them must be true, in virtue of what went before. It may indeed, and it does, receive Confirmation from what follows; but the first Foundation of its Truth is laid in the *Verses* preceding, according to plain and necessary Construction. So that the Sense of the *Verses* following, with which you begin your *Paraphrase*, cannot certainly be known without taking what goes before into Consideration.

Now this you have wholly omitted to do, and have pass'd over the three *Verses* just mention'd with so profound a Silence, as if there was no manner of Connexion between them and what you have explain'd.

Now

Now this is an *Artifice* so utterly unjustifiable in any one who takes upon himself the Part of a *Paraphrast*, that I am really surpriz'd that even a concern for your Reputation did not guard you against a Method of proceeding so very unusual, and so liable to be suspected of Fraud. For indeed your Management herein has but an *odd Aspect*, the Verses you have omitted containing a *Key* to what follows, and being of singular Use for opening and ascertaining the Sense of the whole *Passage*. Wherefore

VII. SEVENTHLY, I shall now undertake to shew, that the Interpretation you have given of this *Passage*, and the Doctrine you have built upon it, is flatly contrary to the plain and express Design of the *Apostle*, as it appears from these very Words, which you have so *dextrously* remov'd from your Reader's Eyes. It is Time therefore that these Words shou'd be examin'd. In order to this, I desire it may be observ'd, that the chief Vice among the *Corinthians* was Pride and a high Conceit of themselves and their spiritual Accomplishments: And that this

F

Distem-

Distemper of the Mind produc'd the usual Effects of it among them — Schisms, Heresies, Faction, and Party-Quarrels. With *this Charge* against them, the *Apostle* begins his *first Epistle*, and with *this* He Ends his *Second*. Now I beseech you Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same Thing, and that there be no Divisions among you. — For it hath been declar'd unto me of you, — that there are Contentions among you \*. And towards the close of the *Second Epistle*, He repeats the same Charge, and tells them — I fear lest when I come, I shall not find you such as I would, — Lest there be Debates, Envyings, Wraths, Strifes, Backbitings, Whisperings, Swellings, Tumults † — And it is for this factious Disposition that reign'd so much among them, that the *Apostle* calls them carnal — Whereas there is among you Envyng, and Strife, and Divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as Men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal ‡? And this proneness of theirs to Disputes, and Quarrels with one another, from their

\* 1 Cor. 1. 10, 11.

† 2 Cor. 12. 20.

‡ 1 Cor. 3. 3, 4.

being puff'd up for one Teacher, against another \*, He seems to have had in his View, thro' the whole Series of Divine Instructions contain'd in both *Epistles*. And accordingly it was not likely that He should slip the occasion of mentioning to them the evil Consequences of this unhappy Temper, from its accompanying them even at the Celebration of the most solemn Acts of Religion. Wherefore He tells them —  
*Now in this that I declare unto you, I praise you not, that ye come together not for the better, but for the worse † —* How this happen'd He tells them in the next Verse; for first of all, *when you come together in the Church, I hear that there be Divisions among you: for his belief of which Report having given a Reason in the 18th Verse, He adds at the 20th Verse — When ye come together therefore into one Place, This is not to eat the Lord's Supper — which He proves by the Words that follow, For in eating every one taketh before other his own Supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken ‡.*

\* 1 Cor. 4. 6.

† 1 Cor. 11. 17.

‡ 1 Cor. 11. 21.

Now 'tis here as plain as Words can make it, that the Apostle's Charge against the *Corinthians* is for their being divided into Schisms and Parties, of which, as He had made mention several Times before; so He had now a more than common Occasion to mention them, forasmuch as they brought them along with them into the *Church*: such an high Degree of Rancour and Animosity was certainly a great Crime in those who had it, and 'tis therefore no Wonder the Apostle charges it, as what disqualify'd them for a due Participation of the Lord's Supper; *Οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑμεῖς ἀξιοὶ δεῖπνον κυρίου*: It is not lawful for you to eat, or, ye cannot eat the Lord's Supper. For this is plainly the Sense of these Words. And altho' our Translators have render'd them, by inserting the Word *This* — and so give the Sense thus — *This is not to eat the Lord's Supper*; yet this rendring is corrected in the *Margin*, and the true one is given as above — *Ye cannot eat the Lord's Supper*; That is, ye cannot do it without the Guilt of partaking of it in an unworthy Manner.

AND to make them the more sensible  
of



of the Mischiefs of their Schisms and Contentions, He instances in one Effect of them, which was, that they would not tarry for one another to eat together of the Feast which then usually preceded the *Lord's Supper*; In as much as every one took before others what He had brought, altho' it was originally intended for Part of a *Common Banquet*, in token of their Love to one another, and in order to increase the same. The Consequence of which Practice was, that, whilst one was *hungry*, another eat and drank even to *fulnes*; according as they were able or not able, to provide their *Share* towards a *Banquet*, in the true Purpose and Use of it intended to be *Common*. This is what the Apostle justly upbraids them for at the 22d Verse.

WHAT? have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not\*. This is a great abuse of the Design of these Feasts, and a shameful Effect of your Quarrels and Discontents; and

\* 1 Cor. 11. 22.

I discommend you very much for being guilty of it.

ALTHO' therefore the *Apostle* reproves them for this abuse of their *Love-Feasts*; yet the principal Point in his View was, to shew the Mischief, and the Guilt of their Schisms, of which this very *Indecency it self* was the Effect; and to prevail upon them no longer to suffer such *unruly Passions* to indispose their Minds for a due Participation of the *Lord's Supper*.

Now this gives a just Reason for the *Examination* He afterwards enjoins: Forasmuch as such a Party-Spirit, as then prevail'd among them, was not only difficult to be cured, but would be apt to assume the Character of *Sanctity* and *Religion*. Their Disputes were, as we have seen, concerning the Dignity and Excellence of their *Instructors*; and they were ready to think, they did Honour to their *Saviour* by contending for a Superiority of Merit and Accomplishments in those *Ministers of Christ*, who had been the happy Instruments of their Conversion.

STRIFE and Contention, 'tis too well known, will grow up to a strange Height of Rage and Fury from very small Beginnings; but it is never so lasting, nor so difficult to be master'd, as when it takes its Rise from a Matter that is good in it self, and that will justify the Use of some Degree of Zeal and Earnestness. For the *goodness* of the Cause will presently be thought to *sanctify* the Means used in the Defense of it; and so, a Man may be in the very *gall of Bitterness*, and yet amuse himself with the Thoughts of his being all the while doing what is acceptable to God, and beneficial to Religion.

Now this seems to have been the Case of the *Corinthians*. They had all very good Reason to *hold the Persons* of their Instructors in *Admiration*, as well for the Gifts of God, which were so conspicuous in them, as for the Benefits they had themselves receiv'd from them. As many of them therefore as had *imprudently* taken occasion from thence, of falling into factious Quarrels and Disputes, would need to inquire with great Diligence and Nicety into the most secret Thoughts

Thoughts of their Hearts, in order to free themselves from Prejudices that had taken the first Root in them from the just Sense they had of the *value* and Importance of the *Christian Religion*. For certainly no Mistakes work so forcibly, nor are so little capable of *Cure* and *Restraint*, as those which are founded in *Religious Pretenses*. Here then was just ground for the *Examination* requir'd: Nothing less than a very careful and laborious Inquiry into the true State and Disposition of their Minds could be sufficient to cure and remove such *Prejudices*, and to qualify those who labour'd under them, for a due Participation of the Holy Mysteries. Whereas if the whole Reason of the Examination had been, that they might assure themselves that they did not eat and drink as at a *Common Feast*, but in *Remembrance* of their *Saviour*; as this is supposing them to be *solemnly* call'd upon to inquire into a Matter, of which it is impossible to conceive how they could be ignorant; so does the Word [δοκιμαζέτω] that contains this Direction, import so much strictness, of Inquiry in order to *Approbation*, that

the

the *Apostle* could never have used it in a Case that so little requir'd it.

It appears therefore, that the *Examination* has Regard to a different Matter, and was order'd for a quite different Reason from that which you give, and particularly for the Purpose of making a Judgment of themselves concerning their Fitness and Qualifications for a Participation of the *Lord's Supper*, before they came together, and not at the Time when they were assembled for that End.

For the Words *ὅτι ἐν Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν* — whether they are render'd, *It is not lawful\* for you, or ye cannot eat the Lord's Supper*, or, "*This is not to eat the Lord's Supper as it ought to be eaten*"; (which is your Sense of them) whether, I say, they are render'd one Way or the other, they

\* The Author to the *Hebrews* uses the Word *ἐν* for *ἐν* in like Manner as it is here used — *ἐν τῇ αἰσθησει τοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς*. *Heb. 9. 5.* And *Homer* uses the Word *ἐν* in this Sense of *licet*, or *fas est*, twice in the same Place,

— *ἐν μὲν εὐδν,*  
*Ἐν δὲ προμύνοιον ἀκρίδων.*

*Hom. Odyss. Lib. O. Vers. 391, 392.*

G

have



have a necessary Reference to what went before, and are brought as a sad Proof of the Danger and Mischiefs of their *Schisms* and *Heresies*.

'TIS true indeed, the Apostle confirms his Charge against them of their *unworthiness* to eat of the *Lord's Supper*, from the unseemly Effect of their Divisions in their publick Assemblies, where they shew'd their Resentments against one another to such a Degree, that many among them would not even eat together with others of that which was design'd as a Part of a Common Banquet. Now this is indeed charg'd upon them as an *Aggravation* of their unworthiness in partaking of the *Lord's Supper* then presently to follow; and it is justly charg'd upon them as such; forasmuch as it was really an Effect of Rancour and Ill-Will, and was a Thing very indecent in it self.

BUT notwithstanding this, the main Charge of *unworthiness* is made upon them in the Words that go before, (of which you make not the least mention) And when those Words are consider'd, as they  
 need

necessarily must be, as a Part of the *Passage* you have undertaken to explain, 'tis evident beyond Contradiction, that the Thing *first* and *principally* complain'd of, as what disabled the *Corinthians* to perform this Duty in a right Manner, was a Temper and Disposition of Mind not to be reform'd in an *Instant*, and at the Time of the Celebration of this Ordinance, but which requir'd much previous Thought and *Examination*, in order to a through and effectual Cure and removal of it. I think therefore, and I flatter my self, I have prov'd, that you have misrepresented the true Design and Meaning of this *Passage*, from one End of it to the other: And that I may shew this still more distinctly and more particularly, I shall now proceed to consider the *Propositions* you have drawn from this famous *Passage*, and your Comments upon them, *for the use of Christians*, as you say, *in these latter Ages of the Gospel*.

XII. The EXAMINATION here mention'd by St. Paul as regarding the Lord's Supper, is, strictly speaking, a Christian's Examination of his own Heart, and Disposition,

sition, by the Institution of this Holy Rite, in order to assure Himself that He comes to the Lord's Supper, and will behave himself at it, not as a Common Meal, or an ordinary eating and drinking, but as a particular Rite, appointed by Christ, viz. That He comes to it, in order to eat this Bread and drink this Wine in a serious and Religious Remembrance of Him, and of his Death.

THIS you endeavour to confirm by saying, that the mention of *Examination* here was intirely owing to the *Corinthians* being guilty of coming to the Lord's Supper in this Manner\*, eating and drinking as at a Common Meal; and consequently that *Christians* who examine themselves so far as to keep clear of this Manner of partaking of the Lord's Supper, have fully observ'd the Apostle's Direction in this place.

Now one would be apt to imagine, that when you thus take upon you to pronounce *Christians* safe as to any unworthiness they can be guilty of in this Holy Action, if

\* Pag. 72.

they

they do but *seriously remember* their *Lord's Passion* therein; one would be ready, I say, to think that the *Apostle* had express'd himself very fully to this Point, and that no body could well mistake his Meaning.

AND yet as there are very few even among the *Socinians* themselves, who have presum'd to represent this Duty of *Examination* in this Manner, and *Christians* of all other Denominations, have almost to a Man, grounded the necessity of a much more strict and more extensive *Examination* upon this very Passage, which ought to have made you more *modest*, and *cautious* in this Matter; so, after all, there is nothing here that gives any *Countenance* to your Notion; and the Facts supposed by you, concerning the Ignorance and Intemperance of the *Corinthians*, upon which you ground it, are not only false, as I have plainly shewn, but impossible to be affirm'd by our *Apostle* without Inconsistency.

YOU are so good indeed as to allow that  
 " an Examination of a Man's whole Life  
 " by the Law of God, must be of great  
 " use

“ use to *Christians* ;” but then you add, that  
 “ every Man is a Judge for himself of the  
 “ proper Time for this ; and that it is not  
 “ a Duty necessarily previous to the *Lord's*  
 “ *Supper*, nor spoken of by *St. Paul*, as ne-  
 “ cessary to our duly partaking of it.”\*

Now methinks, if this be a Practice so  
 useful and commendable in it self, it is very  
 probable it has a Foundation somewhere in  
*Holy Scripture*. And if it be proper to be  
 done by all Men *sometimes*, and by most  
 Men *often*, it should seem to be most suit-  
 able to do it, before the Time that we are  
 in a more particular Manner to make a so-  
 lemn Acknowledgment of our Faith in  
 Christ, and of our Obligations to perform  
 his Will according to the Terms of the Co-  
 venant He hath obtain'd for us. And this  
 should naturally lead us to believe, that  
 where an *Examination* is so particularly men-  
 tion'd as the Means of receiving the Lord's  
 Supper *worthily*, it must be understood to  
 extend to every Act of it that is not only  
 useful in it self, but at that Time in an  
 especial Manner *suitable* and *proper*.



So that unless the *Apostle* had as distinctly told the *Corinthians*, as you do your *Readers*, that the *Examination* He speaks of, concerns the Time of their *actual receiving only*, and was intended ONLY to prevent their doing it without Thought or Attention, to what they were about, it seems to me unaccountably *rash* in you, to declare so peremptorily that the *Examination* commanded can extend no farther. But forasmuch as the *Apostle* expressly charges them with Schisms and Divisions, and does clearly make those Schisms and Divisions the Cause of their unworthiness; and forasmuch as nothing but a previous, deliberate, and strict *Examination* could be sufficient for the cure and the mastery of such Evils, your Assertion is not only rash, but absurd also.

You attempt however to support this Notion of yours, strange and absurd as it is, from the *Publick Office of our Church*: And you observe that "the Duty of *Examination* is proposed to them, who are at that very Time supposed to remain in the Church as Communicants; and they are  
" call'd

“ call’d upon at that Time to judge and  
 “ approve themselves;” which Practice of  
 the Church you suppose must be founded  
 upon this, “ That even so short an *Exami-*  
 “ *nation* may be sufficient, to satisfy a true  
 “ Christian whether He comes to the *Lord’s*  
 “ *Supper* with a Temper and Behaviour  
 “ suitable to the *Institution*, according to  
 “ what *St. Paul* hath said about it. \*

Now I do not wonder to find you here  
 and elsewhere very desirous to make the  
*Decisions* and *Offices* of the Church consistent  
 with your *Scheme*; but when the Thing is  
 so utterly impracticable, I cannot but own  
 my self surpriz’d at the Attempt. Certain-  
 ly you may as well accuse the Church of  
*Popery* or *Pelagianism*, or any Thing else  
 that is contrary to sound Doctrine, and may  
 as easily prove the same by Her *Liturgy*, and  
*Articles*, as you can shew that She encour-  
 ages her Members to take up with your  
 Notion of the *Examination* requir’d by *St.*  
*Paul*.

It is true indeed in the *Exhortation* you

\* Pag. 73.

allude

allude to in the *Communion Office*, the Church makes the *Minister* call upon the Persons present, to *judge themselves*, that they be not *judged of the Lord*; but then the Particulars that follow, evidently shew, that the Judgment or Trial of themselves must have been made some Time before.

FOR the Particulars concerning which they are to examine themselves, are, whether they *repent them truly of their Sins past*, have a *lively Faith in Christ our Saviour*, have amended, or at least are fully determin'd to *amend their Lives*, and are in *perfect Charity with all Men*.

NOW He that thinks He can upon the sudden, without any previous Thought or Consideration, pass a Judgment upon himself concerning all those Particulars (unless He is one who has liv'd in a constant and habitual *Preparation*) must have different Notions of Repentance, and Amendment, of Faith and Charity, than what the Holy Scriptures will warrant.

THE Design of the Church therefore,  
H is

is to put the Persons, offering themselves for Communion, in mind of the *Examination* that is necessary in order to a meet Participation of the *Holy Mysteries*; that they who have not made it, or who are not able then to make it (which no one can who is not habitually prepar'd) may in Time consider of their Danger, and not presume to go in a Manner so unprepar'd to that *Holy Table*.

AND accordingly in the *Invitation* that immediately follows, those only are bid to draw near, and *take the Holy Sacrament*, who *do truly and earnestly repent of their Sins, and are in Love and Charity with their Neighbours, and intend to lead a new Life, following the Commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his Holy Ways*. Now these Words, at the same Time that they stand in direct Opposition to your Notion of the Possibility of a Man's receiving *worthily*, without Repentance or a Resolution of Amendment, are plainly intended to warn all Persons against *receiving*, who are not qualify'd by a suitable *Preparation*. This I think sufficient in Answer to what you have alleg'd

in

in order to make the Church vouch for your Notion of the *Examination* requir'd by St. *Paul*.

BUT when what She has farther said in the *Exhortations* to be used when Warning is given the Week before for the Celebration of the *Holy Communion*; when *this*, I say, is also taken into Consideration, I am in doubt by what Name to call your *Attempt*.

FOR in the first of those *Exhortations* the Church declares, that all Christians, in order to avoid the Peril of *unworthy* receiving, *must examine their Consciences* so, that *they may come holy and clean* to that Heavenly Feast; and that *the Way and Means* thereto is, First to examine their *Lives and Conversations by the Rule of God's Commandments*, *confess themselves to Almighty God, with full Purpose of Amendment* of Life, *reconcile themselves to all those Persons* whom they have offended, *be ready to make Restitution and Satisfaction for all Wrongs done to others, and to forgive all Offences against themselves*; and then declares peremptorily that if these Things are not done — *The receiving the*



*Holy Communion doth nothing else but increase their Damnation.*

AND in the Second of those *Exhortations*, when a wicked Man is introduced saying, in excuse of his Neglect of this Duty, *I am a grievous Sinner, and therefore am afraid to come*, The Church does not go about to lessen his Fears of receiving *unworthily*, by intimating to Him, (as you have more than intimated to all the World) that those Fears are groundless, and that the Wickedness of his Life is no Bar to the *worthiness* of performing this Duty, if He do but attend seriously to the Design of it in the Act of performing it: No, She acknowledges no such Doctrine; She indeed abhors it; and therefore answers this Excuse in a quite contrary Way, by putting this short but awakening Answer; *Wherefore then do ye not repent and amend?*

IF these Declarations of the Church, so contrary to your Notion of this Matter, and so contrary to what you would fasten upon the Church as Her Notion, were not thought of by you, when you wrote this

Part

Part of your Book we are now considering, your Inattention and Negligence are to be blam'd; and if they were thought of, it will be extremely difficult for you, to clear your self from the Imputation of putting a willful Abuse not upon your Readers only, but upon the Church also.

XIII. *The Duty of Preparation for the Holy Communion, being intirely founded upon these few Words of St. Paul, Let a Man examine Himself — It is evident from the foregoing Proposition, that the Preparation imply'd in these Words, as necessary and sufficient, is such a Consideration of the Institution it self, as may satisfy and assure us, that we come to the Lord's Supper, as his sincere Disciples, resolved to eat and drink in a Religious Remembrance of Him; or, with Dispositions and a Behaviour worthy of, that is, suitable to, the Design of this Duty.*

THIS Proposition stands altogether upon the Credit of the foregoing, and must therefore fall with it. So that after so much has been offer'd by me against the Truth  
of

of the former, 'twill be needless to say any Thing of *this*, or of your Comment that follows it.

XIV. *It is evident from the Passage now before us, that the whole Affair of eating and drinking UNWORTHILY in St. Paul's Sense, is confin'd to the frame of our Minds, and our Behaviour AT the very Time of our Performance of this Religious Duty.*

YOU say, the *whole Affair* (for so you oddly term it) of eating and drinking *unworthily*, is *confin'd to the Time of our Performance of this Duty*. So that whatever gross Impieties a Christian may have been guilty of, tho' He be a *Blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his Word, an Adulterer, or be in Malice, or Envy, or in any other grievous Crime \**, and comes to that *Holy Table* without any Degree of Repentance or remorse for his Sins; He may notwithstanding all this, partake of the *Lord's Supper* not only *innocently*, but *worthily*, if the frame of his Mind, and his Behaviour be

\* First Exhort. Comm.

but

but serious and agreeable to the Design of the Institution, AT the Time of his doing so.

Now whether this be true or no, it is unaccountable Confidence to *palm* this upon your Readers, for the Sense of our *Church*, when it is so evidently contrary to her express Declaration in the close of the *Exhortation* just now mention'd. But surely this is not only contrary to the Sense of our *Church*, but of all other *Churches* that are or ever were in the *Christian World*. It is indeed so *monstrous*, that I should have been ready to have question'd my own Apprehension concerning your Design in this *Proposition*, if you had not your self so fully explain'd it in the Words that immediately follow.

BUT you say expressly, that if *some among the Corinthians had not been guilty of great and criminal Indecencies, at the very Time of the Celebration, we had not heard of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily* \*. By which you affirm, or there

\* Pag. 76.

is neither Sense nor Meaning in what you say, that *no Crimes* how gross soever and tho' utterly unrepented of, can disqualify any *Christian* for partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, or can bring Guilt and Punishment upon Him for so doing, but what are committed in the very Act of *receiving*.

GOD forbid that any *Position*, so contrary to *sound Doctrine*, should have a *real* Foundation in any of those Writings receiv'd by the Church as the Word of God. For I much question, whether its being clearly and plainly found therein, would not evacuate all the Evidence of the *Divine Inspiration* of that Part of *Scripture*; It being a *Position* inconsistent with the Truth of God's Attributes, destructive of Morality, and contrary to the whole Tenor of the sacred Writings.

BUT we need not be in Pain for the Credit of *St. Paul*, or his Writings: For this is all a Calumny upon both. And what I have prov'd of the Nature of that Guilt, wherein the unworthiness of the *Corinthians* did consist, does demonstrate, that it is so.

BUT



BUT how dares any one say, that “ we  
 “ had not heard of the Crime and Danger  
 “ of *eating* and *drinking* unworthily, if it had  
 “ not been for this Criminal Indecency of  
 “ the *Corinthians*”? Was it not then the  
 Design of God, that this *Epistle* should be  
 written, and preserv’d for the general In-  
 struction of the World? Have we at this  
 Day the Benefit of all those most excellent  
 and most instructive Particulars therein con-  
 tain’d, by mere Accident? And is this most  
 important Doctrine concerning *Examination*,  
 whether interpreted in your Way, or mine,  
 of so little use to the Christian World, that  
 if this early Guilt of the *Corinthians* had not  
 given occasion for this Command concern-  
 ing it, the World would for ever have been  
 depriv’d of the Benefit of so important a  
 Rule, and would have been left to have  
 done their Duty therein just as it might  
 have happen’d?

IF this so very exceptionable a Manner  
 of Expression slipp’d from you without De-  
 sign, your Reputation as a *correct* and cau-  
 tious Writer will only be impeach’d; but  
 if you meant all that it imports, I know  
 I not

not how you will reconcile it with a Belief that these Epistles were written under the special Motion and Direction of God's *Holy Spirit*, for the general Benefit and Edification of all *Christians* thro' all Ages of the Church.

XV. *Whoever therefore eats this Bread, and drinks this Wine, with a serious and Christian frame of Mind, and a Behaviour suitable to the Design of the Institution; partaking of it, as a sincere Disciple of Christ, under the Sense of his own strict Obligations as such, remembering his Body broken, and his Bloud shed at the same Time, and doing the whole in Remembrance of Christ, as his Lord and Master; certainly cannot possibly be said to eat and drink UNWORTHILY, or as far as this particular Action is concern'd, to behave Himself unsuitably to it, or to his own Character as a Christian.*

NOW this Proposition taken by it self, and in the plain and just Meaning of the Words is certainly true; because it cannot be conceiv'd how a Man can be unprepar'd for a  
worthy

worthy Participation of the *Holy Mysteries*, who comes with the Qualifications, and behaves in the excellent Manner here described.

BUT tho' this *Proposition* is true, yet it does not serve your Purpose, because you make it a Consequence from those foregoing *Propositions*, which I have evidently shewn to be false. You here infer, that a Person who partakes of the Lord's Supper in the Manner describ'd, cannot possibly partake thereof *unworthily*, because, as you express it, *The whole Affair of eating and drinking unworthily in St. Paul's Sense, is confin'd to the frame of our Minds, and our Behaviour AT the very Time of our Performance of this Religious Duty* \*.

BUT now, if this is affirm'd without Foundation, and the *Apostle* charges the Guilt of unworthiness upon the *Corinthians*, for their partaking of this *Ordinance* without Repentance, and a Reformation of that uncharitable Disposition of Mind that had so publickly shewn it self in their *Divisions* and Quarrels, as has been largely shewn;

\* Prop. 14.

then your false *Premisses* will not warrant this *Proposition* which you draw as a *Conclusion* from them; but, for any Thing you have prov'd to the contrary, it may after all, be false.

FOR if a *Preparation* of Heart be requir'd by the *Apostle*, which cannot be sufficiently made without Time for a diligent Trial and *Examination*; then He who communicates in the want of this, (in how strong Terms soever you *artfully* express the Excellency of his Disposition and Behaviour in the Act of *Communion*) does really perform this Duty *unworthily*, in the Sense of *St. Paul*; because He is defective in the *Preparation* requir'd.

BUT how then is this Matter? Can a Man receive *unworthily*, who comes with the *Disposition*, and behaves in the *Manner* here in this *Proposition* describ'd? No; I think, He cannot. But the Reason is not, because nothing is to be done, in order to a *due* Participation of the Lord's Supper, but what may be fully done AT the Time of *eating* thereof; but, because no Person can  
per-

perform this *Duty* in the *Manner* you here describe, but He must have brought Himself to this most excellent *Frame* of Mind, by a great deal of previous *Consideration*; by having actually *look'd back* upon his past Life, *reform'd* his Corruptions, *strengthen'd* his good Resolutions, and *rais'd* his Desires after Perfection.

So that altho' the *Proposition* is indeed true, and the Person you describe in it, does certainly discharge this *Duty* *worthily*; yet it is in virtue of that *Preparation*, the necessity of which it is the Design of your Book to overthrow; and consequently tho' the *Proposition* is true, it can be of no use to you in your Argument.

To as little Purpose is what you add by way of Illustration of this *Proposition*, when you observe, "That the Point is not, who " is worthy to appear before God in any " Religious Action; but who performs that " Action *worthily*, that is, *suitably* to the " Nature and Design of it, and who *un-  
" worthily*." \*



THIS Observation, I say, is no more pertinent to your way of explaining this *Passage*, than mine; nor does it serve to clear any Thing that is peculiar to your *Scheme*; It being an agreed Point among all, that it is the *worthiness of the Manner* of performing this *Holy Action*, and not the *personal worthiness of the Communicant*, that is the Subject of St. *Paul's* Discourse throughout. The only Question in debate is, whether there is not something requir'd by St. *Paul* previous to the Act of performing this *Duty*, as a necessary Means and Condition of its being perform'd in a *worthy*, and acceptable *Manner*. So that all you have added here in your 80th, and 81st Pages, is foreign to the Matter in hand, and only serves to divert the *Reader* from the Point in question.

XVI. *He only ought to be affrighted at the Words of St. Paul, because He only can, in the Apostle's Sense, be said to eat and drink UNWORTHILY, who, without considering the Duty He professes to perform; without a serious Regard to the Remembrance of his Lord and Master, for which only it was commanded; eats this Bread,*

*Bread, and drinks this Wine, either with no Thought at all of the End of this Institution; (which is one Degree of doing it unsuitably to the Nature of the Thing) or, (which is worse) with Thoughts and Behaviour, utterly inconsistent with the Design of this Holy Rite, or with a Christian's Duty at any Time.*

THE Proposition to which you have so long been preparing and clearing the Way, is introduced at last, with no small Satisfaction (I suppose) and Complacency to your self: But how fond soever you may be of this Production, I must indeed be so free as to tell you, that it appears to others really *monstrous*; and that all your Endeavours in forming and supporting it for the 12 Pages that follow, have not been sufficient to bring it to Perfection.

You here assert, that they only can be said to *eat* and *drink unworthily*, who perform this *Duty* either with no Thought at all of the End of the *Institution*, or with Thoughts and Behaviour inconsistent with it.

IN order to explain this, you make a Distinction, between a *good, serious Christian*, and a *profess'd Christian*. Of the former you say, it is *morally impossible* that He should eat this Bread, without a due Religious Remembrance of the Death of his Master; but that it is not *naturally* impossible, but He may fail in this\*; and when He does thus fail, tho' He be in other Respects *unblameable*, you say, He may justly be said, to eat and drink unworthily, not discerning the Lord's Body†; and you ought to have added, that He thereby eats and drinks his own Damnation.

Now surely this is a very *hard saying*, and which, if it be indeed a just Consequence of your Scheme, which I shall not dispute, is alone sufficient to destroy it. For this is to place a Matter of the greatest Consequence, and upon the right Performance of which the Favour of God depends, in Events that are *dubious*, and not within our own Power.

FOR if it is *morally impossible*, as you say it is, that a *serious Christian* should offend

\* Pag. 80, 81.

† Pag. 81.

in this Manner, He can offend therein only by some *natural* Infirmity, and which no human Guard nor Resolution can prevent.

AND shall He be answerable for this, as one who is guilty of the *Body and Bloud of the Lord*, and shall He thus subject himself to *Damnation*, for a casual *Inattention*, and an undesign'd *Confusion* of thought? For to suppose as you do, that He may *indulge* himself herein \*, is to contradict your own Supposition of its being *morally impossible*, that He should offend in *that* Manner. But I am sure neither our *Apostle*, nor any other *sacred* Writer, nor even common Sense will bear you out in *this Doctrine*. Here you are certainly a most unreasonably *severe Casuist*.

LET us now see how you deal with Him you call a *profess'd Christian*, and whom you suppose to be *blameable in some Parts of the Conduct of his past Life*, and to have *behav'd himself unworthily, or unsuitably to so Holy a Religion*. †

\* Pag. 81.

† Pag. 82.

Now of this Man you say, *if He comes to the Lord's Table, with a serious frame of Mind, on Purpose to remember Christ, as his Lord and Master, in the way appointed by Himself, and actually does so remember Him; such an one cannot be said to eat this Bread and drink this Wine unworthily* \*.

Now here certainly no *Popish Confessor* was ever more *indulgent*. For here is nothing made necessary for *this Man's* partaking of the Lord's Supper in a *worthy* and acceptable *Manner*, but a present Attention to the *sacred Action* He is performing; If He has but quickness of Faculties enough to secure Him against *wild* and *wandering* Thoughts, all is safe, tho' He comes without any Degree of Repentance for the Offenses, He is by you supposed to be guilty of, or any serious Resolution of leaving them, by a more careful Conduct for the future. Which is an *Indulgence* on *this* hand, just as absurd as the *Severity* before mention'd, is on the *other*. And they are, taken together, sufficient to sink any Cause whatsoever, that has not other much bet-

\* Pag. 81, 82.



ter Supports, than what you have yet produced for yours.

YOU seem however to be much delighted with your self for the Pains you have herein taken; as if you had by *these Instances clear'd* up the Matter so well, as effectually to have remov'd all Cause of that Dread of partaking of *the Lord's Supper unworthily*, which many *honest Christians* have been liable to, from the Sense they have been used to put upon this Passage of St. Paul \*.

I MUST own I am surpriz'd to find you amusing your self with so *groundless* a Fancy; In as much as you are really so far from having *settled this Point*, as you say, *in the plainest Manner possible*; that I think I can make it evidently appear, that instead of relieving the Fears of these *honest Christians*, you have given them just Cause for a great *Increase* of them, if they should be so unhappy as to give any Credit to your *Scheme*.

FOR whereas their dread of unworthy partaking of *the Lord's Supper*, is founded in

\* Pag. 82.

an Apprehension, lest their *Preparation* for so solemn a Duty might not be sufficient; they are now told, that, whatever their *Preparation* may be, and how *unblameable* soever they may be in other respects, yet if they should chance to entertain any *Thoughts* at the very Time of partaking, whereby they do not make a sufficient Difference between the Lord's Supper, and an ordinary Entertainment\*, which may thro' mere *natural* Infirmary, and the weakness of their Faculties sometimes be the Case, all their Endeavours to please God by observing his *Ordinance* are frustrated; on the contrary, they are guilty of the Body and Bloud of the Lord; and eat and drink Damnation to themselves.

Now since no care in Persons of weak and *infirm* Minds, or indeed in any others, (without the special Assistance of God's Holy Spirit, which is quite left out of your *Scheme*) can be sufficient to guard them against the *unhappiness* just mention'd; what fresh Cause of new and perpetual Fear and Distrust, have you administer'd to those very Persons, for whose Benefit you often, and

\* Pag. 81.

in this Place particularly, pretend you have taken all these Pains? If melancholic Persons were under some anxiety and disturbance of Mind before, for fear their Performance of this Duty might be attended with Danger; I think verily, if they were once persuaded of the Truth of your *No-tion*, there would be Reason to apprehend, that their *Anxiety* would soon grow into downright *Distraction*.

FOR just contrary to your Pretences, and to the Practice of all *skillful Divines*, you have laid out your Endeavours, in making the Performance of this Duty easy, only to *imperfect Christians*, and to those, who, whatever they may *believe* of *Christianity*, have not brought themselves to the sincere *Practice* of it; but have entangled the *honest*, the *sincere*, the UNBLAMEABLE *Christians* with new Fears and Scruples; and have represented this Holy Ordinance as a downright SNARE to them.

FOR whilst the whole Design of your *Scheme* is to *rob* them of the comfortable *Hopes* they have been taught to conceive of  
great

great *Benefits* from a due Participation of these *Holy Mysteries*; you now alarm them with new and unexpected Dangers, and such too as no *human* Care and Diligence can be sufficient always to prevent. So that I believe the Reader will think with me that those *honest Christians*, for whose use you would be thought to have explain'd St. Paul's Doctrine in this *Passage*, are, of all Men living, the least indebted to you for your Pains.

BUT you go on, repeating still and inculcating the same Thing, which after what I have already offer'd in answer, I might well be excused from taking notice of, if you had not added something equally exceptionable with what has been already answer'd. This you have done at the Bottom of your 83<sup>d</sup> Page, where you say, "It will not follow from a Person's past Failures in other Points of Duty, that He partakes of the Lord's Supper unworthily in St. Paul's Sense; if his Temper and Behaviour at the Time of partaking, be *suitable* to it, and worthy of a true Christian. For if this were the Case, no one who had been a will-  
ful

“ *ful Sinner*, could ever partake of this Rite  
 “ otherwise than *unworthily*.

Now if by a *Temper and Behaviour at the Time of partaking, suitable to it, and worthy of a true Christian*, you mean the doing it under a real Sorrow for *past Failures*, attended with true *Repentance* and a sincere Resolution of *Amendment*; then you give a new State of the Point in question, and such as (if you avow it) stands in direct Opposition to all you have advanc'd against the necessity of an *Examination* previous to the Time of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*. For by this State of the Manner of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, you grant the Thing you have been all this while opposing. But if you understand (as you must if you are consistent with your self) such a Temper of Mind only, in the actual Performance of this Duty, as, tho' you suppose it to be worthy of a *true Christian*, yet is not attended with sincere *Repentance*; then the Reason you give, why such a Person cannot be guilty of partaking of the Lord's Supper unworthily, has no manner of Force or Pertinence in it.

FOR



FOR how does it follow, that a Person *once a willful Sinner*, but *now* in a State of Repentance, and under a full Conviction of the Folly and Baseness of his past Transgressions, cannot partake of this *Holy Ordinance worthily*, because no *unrepenting Sinner* can? The having been guilty of *willful Sins* was never made by any one the Ground and Reason of *receiving unworthily*; but the continuing still under the Power of them, and being still unresolv'd to leave them. So that I cannot see how you can avoid the Charge either of misunderstanding your own repeated *State* of the Question, or of arguing from the true State of it very weakly and inconsequentially.

YOU go on, and say, " The *Corinthians* "  
 " *Christians* were not forbid to come to the  
 " Performance of this Duty again, but were  
 " requir'd to come in a serious and Chri-  
 " stian Manner, but without the least En-  
 " couragement to them, to hope for God's  
 " Favour, without their Amendment"\*.  
 But this is not by far a true and full Re-

\* Pag. 84.

presentation of the Case of the *Corinthian Christians*.

St. PAUL tells them, that because of their uncharitable *Divisions*, they came together in their Publick Assemblies *not for the better, but for the worse*, because they were thereby made incapable of eating the Lord's Supper in a worthy Manner. Wherefore that they might avoid this Guilt, and the dreadful Punishment of it, He exhorts 'em not to approach the *Lord's Table* before they had *examin'd* and approv'd themselves to their own Consciences.

ALTHO' then it continued a Duty upon them, to partake of this Holy Ordinance, yet they were hereby admonish'd not to do it, without a previous *Approbation* of themselves to their own Consciences; and there is no Intimation given, that the best and most perfect Behaviour in the Act of partaking of this *Rite*, would make amends for any Defects antecedent thereunto. But without such a *Preparation*, they are plainly told, they would involve themselves in the *Guilt*, and would draw upon themselves

L

the

the Punishment of eating and drinking unworthily.

AND the Case is the same with regard to Sinners among *Christians* at this Day. They must not come to this *Holy Table* without *Repentance*, and a serious Resolution of *Amendment*. These are the Points they must *examine* themselves upon, and *approve* themselves in, or they will come to the Blessed Sacrament, as the *Corinthians* did, *not for the better, but for the worse*: They will increase their Condemnation, by adding the Guilt of unworthily partaking of the *Holy Mysteries*, to their Impenitence.

So that what you observe at the close of your 84<sup>th</sup> Page, that the partaking of the *Lord's Supper* "with a serious Frame of Mind, may happily lead Men to a forsaking of all their Sins, and a total Amendment of Life", is making *that* the *End* and *Effect* of this *Duty*, which is plainly requir'd as the *Means* of duly performing it.

VERY many and very great are the good Effects

Effects of this Holy Ordinance: But the Doctrine of its being an Ordinance for the Conversion of Sinners, has no Foundation either in this *Passage* of Scripture, or any other.

YOU undertake to explain this Matter still farther by the Instances of *Faith* and *Prayer*.

1. YOU suppose a Man may perform this Duty worthily, tho' He be an *habitual Sinner*; and you endeavour to illustrate the Matter by the Instance of *Faith*, which you say a Man may have, and may thereby *act a good Part, and a Part acceptable to God, altho' He does not regulate his Practice by the Precepts of Christ.*\*

Now here altho' I think you ascribe more to the *bare Act* of Faith without *Works*, than the *Holy Scriptures*, or the Nature of Faith will warrant, and so make an improper Choice of it for an Instance to *illustrate* the Point in hand; yet if it should indeed be granted, that *Faith* is in it self *accepta*.

\* Pag. 85, 86, 87.

ble to God, as you represent it to be, and that it may therefore fitly serve to explain your *Notion* in this Matter; yet it is to no manner of Purpose in the Argument, without absurdly supposing the very Point in question. So that the Matter in debate remains just as it did, notwithstanding this pretended *Illustration*, and must still be determin'd only by what appears to be the Meaning of St. Paul in this *Passage*, which has been so long under Consideration.

2. YOUR other *Instance* is that of *Prayer* \*, concerning which you say, that "A Person may possibly perform this Duty, with his Understanding and his Affections suitably disposed for it, and yet *relapse* into the Practice of Sin"; And that "this unhappy Man will not be condemn'd by God, for performing his Duty of Prayer with Dispositions suitable to it; but that He will be condemn'd notwithstanding this, for the wilful Practice of Sin."

I THINK you have not stated this Matter with the utmost Accuracy; but I sup-

\* Pag. 86.



pose your Meaning is this; that as a Man may *pray to God* in an *acceptable* Manner, and so as not to incur the danger of Punishment for so doing, and yet may come before GOD under the Guilt of unrepented Sins; so also that He may partake of the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* without offending God thereby, tho' He comes under the *same* Guilt, provided He does it in a serious Remembrance of *Christ*.

Now in order to make this *Instance* to your Purpose, you must not only shew, that *Christians* may perform the *Duty of Prayer acceptably* at the same time that they perform it with the Guilt of *unrepented* Sins upon them, but that the Case of *praying* to God, is in all Points *parallel* to the Case of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*.

As to the *former* Particular, I see no Cause to deny, but *Christians* under the Guilt of wilful Sins, may make their *Prayers* to God, in an *acceptable* Manner, for the Protection of his *good Providence*, and for the Assistance of his *Grace* and *Holy Spirit*, to enable and dispose them to do what they

they find themselves in no *sufficient* Disposition for, and for such *strength* of *Faculties*, and such a *goodness* of *Heart*, as may prepare them for a more successful Conflict with *Sin* and *Satan* for the future. But as to the *other* Particular, I think there is so very *wide* a Difference between the two Cases of *praying* to God, and partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, that the force of your Argument grounded upon this *Instance of Prayer*, is quite destroy'd thereby.

FOR altho' there are many Particulars that are *common* to both these Duties, yet there is this *peculiar* to the Duty of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*; that it is a solemn *Recognition* of our Lord as our *Saviour*, and a *Profession* of our readiness to comply with that *Covenant* which He has establish'd in his *Bloud*, whereby we *declare* ourselves oblig'd to a due Performance of what is requir'd on our Parts as the necessary Means of *Acceptance* with GOD.

So that He who makes this *Religious* and Solemn *Declaration* of his thankful Compliance with the Terms of the *Covenant*,  
with-

without having first entreated *God's* Pardon for the Defects of his *Obedience*, and especially for Transgressions of a very *criminal* Kind, and without having humbled his Soul by a sincere *Sorrow* for them, and having form'd a *firm Resolution* of more *Care* for the future, does plainly give the Lie to his *Profession* so solemnly made, even at the Moment He is making it, and is justly chargeable with *Hypocrisy* and *Profaneness*. And the Case of a *Christian* in this pretended Acknowledgment of Subjection, and Obedience to his *Lord*, seems to differ from that of Him who barely discharges the Duty of *Prayer*, as the *swearing Fealty and Allegiance*, and the performing therewith a publick *solemn Homage* to a *Prince*, differs from presenting a *Petition* or *Address* to Him. And as a *Subject* who shou'd presume to do *Homage* to his *King* with Rebellion in his Heart, and publicly and solemnly profess his Obligation to *obey* those Laws, for which He has no *Reverence*, and which He has never once made a *serious Resolution* to *obey*, would but heighten the Guilt of his *Rebellion*, by such an odious Act of *Baseness* and *Hypocrisy*; so in the Case before us, the *Solemnities* perform'd

in

in the Celebration of this Duty, are all of such a Kind, that without the Truth and Reality of *Repentance* preceding, they can only serve to *condemn* Men for *falseness* and *insincerity*.

AND if you had duly attended to what you here say your self, where you mention the *Prayer* of the wicked Man's being sometimes an *Abomination to the Lord*\*, you might have been led to have corrected your Mistake in this Matter.

FOR the *solemn Professions* before mention'd, if not attended with *Repentance*, are just of the Nature of those *Prayers* of the *Wicked*, which you describe and acknowledge to be an *Abomination to the Lord*†, being put up by Men whose "Hearts are wickedly disposed, and far from God, at the very Time when they pray, or rather when they are willing to appear unto Men to pray."

FOR I think what you here say does not only defeat the design of your *Instance*, but

\* Pag. 86.

† Ibid,

opens to view the Hinge upon which the Cause it self turns, and detects the *Fallacy* of your whole *Scheme*.

YOU all along place the virtue of performing this *Holy Action* *worthily*, in those Dispositions, and *that* Behaviour which are shewn AT the very Moment of performing it. And in order to make this Supposition appear probable, you never fail to use the strongest Expressions possible to represent the *Excellency* both of Temper, and Behaviour, that a *Christian* ought to shew in the *Act* of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*.

HE is to do it *with a* SERIOUS and CHRISTIAN *frame of Mind*, and a Behaviour SUITABLE to the *Design of the Institution*, as a SINCERE Disciple of Christ, under a Sense of his own STRICT Obligations as such; and the whole in a RELIGIOUS Remembrance of Christ as his LORD and MASTER\*. Now, after you have thus suppos'd the right and acceptable discharge of this Duty to consist in these Things, you yet suppose and affirm, that a *Christian* needs no Preparation

\* Prop. 15. & passim.



for the Attainment of them ; That He needs no length of Time to assure his Heart that He has them\* ; And that if some among the Corinthians had not been guilty of criminal Indecencies at the very Time of the Celebration, we had not heard of the Crime and Danger of eating and drinking unworthily†. And in divers other Passages (too many to be particularly mention'd) throughout your *Treatise*, you either directly, or by necessary Consequence do avow, that no Christian can be disabled from receiving the *Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* worthily, by any Sins whether of *Omission* or *Commission*, that are previous to the *actual Celebration* of this Holy Ordinance.

Now, as I have hinted before, so I here directly affirm, that it is utterly impossible to make these two Suppositions of yours consistent ; Forasmuch as the SERIOUS professing ourselves SINCERE Disciples of *Christ*, under a Sense of our own STRICT Obligations as such, can have neither Sense nor Meaning in it, if it does not amount to a Declaration, that we approve of *Christ's* Laws,

\* Pag. 75.

† Pag. 76.

and thankfully accept of the Terms of his *Covenant*, with a full Purpose of performing them: And is this consistent not only with a Man's not once *questioning Himself* concerning these Particulars, but even with his *fully and assuredly knowing*, that He is neither *sorry* for having offended his *Lord*, nor determin'd to give less Offence for the future?

EITHER therefore such a Person makes his *Profession* of being *Christ's Disciple* in mockery, and under a *Mask of Religion* only, whilst his *Heart is wickedly dispos'd*, and *far from God*, and so partakes of the *Lord's Supper* in a Manner unworthy of the *Institution*; or, if he does it in *Truth and Sincerity*, and in the *full and real* Sense of the Terms you so often use upon the occasion, it is because He is a *real Penitent*, and comes to the Performance of this great *Duty* with a just *Preparation*. And which soever of these *Alternatives* you will chuse to take, the *other* will stand full against your whole *Scheme*, and will effectually destroy all that you have advanc'd as the Sense and Doctrine of *St. Paul* from this *Passage*.

YOU take Notice also of a Place in *Justin Martyr*, the Force and Meaning of which you endeavour to explain away, lest what you have said should seem to imply any Thing contrary to the Discipline of Christians in his Time\*. You have just translated one Clause of the Sentence, but have not given the whole, either in the *Original* or in *English*, nor directed your Reader where to find it; which in a Case of Importance is a Negligence not easily to be excused. The Passage is this — Ἡ τροφή αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστία, ἧς ἐδένι ἄλλῳ μεταχεῖν ἐξόν ἐστιν, ἢ τὰς πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ διδασκόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λατρῶν, καὶ ὅτως βίοντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν †.

—THIS Food is call'd by us, THE EUCHARIST, of which no Person is allow'd to partake, but who does believe the Things to be true that are taught by us, and hath been wash'd in the Laver for remission of Sins and Regeneration, and lives in the Manner that Christ hath commanded.

\* Pag. 88.

† *Justin. Martyr. Apol. prim. pag. 96. Edit. Thirlby.*

You

YOU say 'this last Expression of *Justin's* is *general* and *loose*, and that it is *declar'd* by the *most learned Writers* who cite it, to be meant only of an *imperfect Obedience* to *Christ's Laws* \*. You should have quoted these *most Learned Writers*, and for not doing it, what you here say is to go for just nothing. But you add, that for your *self*, you *think* "*Justin Martyr* could mean no more by it, " than that profess'd Christians, who were " notoriously immoral in their Lives, were " not permitted before good Signs of Re-  
" pentance, to partake of this Religious  
" Rite." †

WELL; admit this to be true. But will it not from hence follow, that it was then thought, that Repentance was a necessary Qualification for a worthy partaking of the *Lord's Supper*? You think not; And say, "That the Foundation of this *Disci-*  
" *pline* was this, and THIS ONLY; that  
" the admitting Persons to the Commu-  
" nion, was esteem'd to be an Acknow-  
" ledgment of them as *Christians* fit to be  
" receiv'd into the Company, and to par-

\* Pag. 28.

† Pag. 89.

" take

“ take in the Religious Offices, of such as  
 “ are really so.” \*

Now I think, an Assertion so confidently made, ought to have been supported by some kind of Proof. But instead of Proof you assure us, “ That it was not only from the  
 “ *Eucharist*, that such were debarr’d, but  
 “ from all other Parts also of the common  
 “ Worship of Christians.” From which suppos’d Fact you argue, that it “ does not  
 “ appear, that *this Discipline* did arise from  
 “ any Thing peculiar to the *Lord’s Supper*,  
 “ nor from any Opinion that such Persons  
 (viz. profess’d Christians who were NOTORIOUSLY IMMORAL in their Lives) could not possibly come to it with  
 “ good Dispositions, and eat and drink in  
 “ such a Manner, as not to fall under St.  
 “ *Paul’s* Denunciations.” †

Y O U build a great deal here upon a Foundation laid in your own *Fancy* only, and which, as I believe, cannot be supported by so much as one ancient Testimony;

\* Pag. 89.

† Pag. 90.



WHAT the Discipline of the Church was in *Justin's* Days, cannot, I suppose, with absolute certainty be known. It is very little that can be learn'd from Him concerning this Matter; and it is all contain'd in what He says just before, and a little after the *Quotation* above, in the two Accounts He gives of the Manner of performing the *publick Service* of the Church.

Now, altho' He does in both those short Accounts represent the Thing in such a Manner, that, if we had nothing else to direct us, might lead us to think it was but one continued *Service*; yet it is to be observ'd, that He so clearly preserves the Distinction in *both* Accounts, between the *Prayers* that *preceded* the *Communion*, and the *Prayers* that were *a Part of the Communion Office*, that there is room to suppose, that there might be many who were present at, and join'd in the *former*, who were not suffer'd to join in the *latter* \*. And what

\* Ἡμεῖς δὲ — τὸν πειρασμένον — ἐπὶ τὰς λειτουργίας ἀληθῶς ἀγορεύειν ἵνα σωτηριώμενοι εἰσὶ, καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ποιησόμεθα — ὅπως τὴν αἰώνιον σωτηρίαν σκευάζωμεν. ἀλλήλους φιλήμεθα ἀπαλλάξόμεθα παυσάμεθα ἢ εὐχῶν. ἔπειτα προσφίεταί τῃ αἰ-

what *Justin* himself gives us leave without difficulty to suppose, the *Canons* of the Councils of *Ancyra*, and *Nice*, (one held in the Year 315. the other in the Year 325.) will not suffer us greatly to doubt of. For from thence we learn, that just after the Conclusion of the *third* Century, the Discipline with regard to receiving *Penitents* to *Communion*, was settled upon a distinction of *them* into several *Classes*, according to the Degrees of their Guilt, and the different Signs of their *Penitence*, and that, agreeably thereunto, they were allow'd to join, some of them in more, others in fewer Parts of the *publick Worship*, for a long Time, even for Years before they were judg'd worthy to partake of the *Lord's Supper* \*.

ἡ ἐκείνη τῶ ἀδελφῶν ἄρτῳ ——— ἡ σιωπλίαντῳ τὰς εὐχὰς  
καὶ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν, ——— διάκονοι διδάσκειν ἐκάστη τῶ παρόντων  
μεταλαβῆν ἀπὸ εὐχαριστηθέντῳ ἄρτι ———

*Just. Mart. Apol. prim. pag. 95, 96. Edit. Thirlby.*

Ἐπειτα ἀνιστάμεθα κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ εὐχὰς πύμπομεν καὶ ὡς  
ᾠοῦμεν, πάντα μένοντες ἡμῶν τῶ εὐχῆς, ἄρτῳ ὡς σφίεται —  
καὶ ὁ παρῶν εὐχὰς ὁμοίως καὶ εὐχαριστίας ——— ἀναπέμπει —  
καὶ ἡ διάδοσις ——— ἀπὸ τῶ εὐχαριστηθέντων ἐκάστη γίνεται ———

Pag. 98.

\* Concil. Ancyran. Can. 4, 5, 6.  
Conc. Nic. Can. 11.

How long this *Discipline* had been in use when these *Councils* were held, is not certainly known; but since there is no Intimation in the *Canons* that mention it, of its being *then* or of *late* erected, and the Reason of its use being the same in *Justin's* Time as *then*, who can say, that what is so very consistent with the Accounts He gives of the *Publick Worship*, might not have been really the *Discipline* of his Time?

AND if this be allow'd, as it is reasonable it should, then all Persons who were excluded from partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, were not, for that Reason, excluded (as you have taken upon you to affirm) "from all other Parts of the common Worship of Christians;" and consequently that the Church *then* believ'd, that a greater Degree of *Preparation*, and fuller and more approv'd Signs of *Penitence*, were necessary for the due partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, than for any other Part of *Christian Worship*.

BEING now come to the end of what you have thought fit to advance upon this Passage of *St. Paul*, I shall also conclude  
N for

for the present, after I have laid before the Reader one short *Inference*, which I think may be very justly drawn from what is here said by the Apostle, concerning the Danger of *unworthily* partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, and which stands in full Opposition to your Notion, of its being vain to expect any *particular Benefits* from a right Performance of this *Duty*. It is this.

SINCE great *Guilt* may be contracted, and severe *Judgments* of God incur'd, by an *unworthy* Participation of the *Lord's Supper*; it is highly reasonable to believe, that the *worthy* Performance of this *Duty*, is proportionably *pleasing to God*, and will be rewarded with *such returns of Blessings*, as may fully answer the hazard and mischief arising from an *unworthy Manner of performing it*. Because as God is infinite in *Mercy* as well as *Justice*, as we learn from Scripture, Reason and Experience; to suppose a *worthy* Performance of this *Duty* to be requir'd under the Hazard of *displeasing God*, and thereby losing the Happiness of *this World*, and the *next*, without any certain *good Effects* to balance that *Danger*, is to represent

sent God Almighty, in a way neither agreeable to *Holy Scripture*, nor the Dictates of *Reason*, nor his usual *Dispensations* towards the Children of Men.

---

### A D D E N D A.

PAG. 23. line 14. add after *Haggai* — with regard to eating. P. 33. l. 2. after foregoing add or following. P. 34. l. 3. after manner add unless they are to be referr'd to the Words immediately following, as Apoc. 9. 17. Καὶ ἔτι οὐκ ἴδον τοὺς ἵππους ἐν τῇ ὄρᾳ, καὶ τοὺς καθημένους ἐπ' αὐτῶν, ἄλλως δὲ οὐκ ἴδον τοὺς πνεύματα, καὶ οὐκ ἴδον τοὺς θανάτους. — P. 37. at the bottom add — And so Arrian uses it; Ἐκάστου ἔργου συνέτη ταῦτα κατηγμένα καὶ τὰ ἀκόλουθα, καὶ ἔτι οὐκ ἔχου ἐπ' αὐτὸ. In E. pistet. Lib. 3. cap. 15.

### E R R A T A

Pag. 7. line 19. for *and that* read *and because*.  
 P. 28. l. 9. read *innocent*.  
 P. 60. l. 19. for *Answer* read *Question*.



( 22 )

that God Almighty in a way neither  
accessible to his servants, nor the Disciples  
of Jesus, nor his most Disciples to  
wards the Children of Men.

#### A D D E N D A

There is now in the Press, and  
will speedily be Publish'd, a Second  
Edition of Part I.

18 JA 53

#### E R R A T A

Page 7 line 10 for and that read and that  
Page 8 line 10 for and that read and that  
Page 9 line 10 for and that read and that

40  
P. 2  
AN

# ANSWER

To a BOOK Intituled

*A plain Account of the Nature and  
End of the*

## SACRAMENT

OF THE

## LORD'S SUPPER.

In a Letter to the AUTHOR.

---

### PART III.

---

By RICHARD WARREN D.D. Rector  
of CAVENDISH in SUFFOLK, and late Fel-  
low of JESUS College in CAMBRIDGE.

---

CAMBRIDGE

Printed for W. THURLBOURN.

And Sold by Mess<sup>rs</sup>. Innys and Manby, S. Birt,  
Charles Rivington, and F. Clay, Bookfellers in  
London. M, DC C, XXXVI.

A. N. S. W. R.

TO A BOOZ

A plain Account of the Manuscript  
and of the

SACRAMENT

OF THE



In a Letter

PART II.

By RICHARD WARREN D.D. of  
CAMBRIDGE COLLEGE in CAMBRIDGE

CAMBRIDGE

Printed for W. THURIBORN

And sold by Messrs. Long and Aldrich, 2, York  
Street, in the Strand, and by F. and J. G. B. in  
London, M.D.C. LXXXVI.



SIR.

THE kind and favourable Reception the two former *Parts* have met with from the *Publick*, encourages me to go on with the Design I at first form'd, of giving a full and distinct *Answer* to every Thing I think exceptionable in your late *Treatise* upon the *Lord's Supper*. Indeed I have so great Satisfaction from the Grounds I have to believe, that what I have already *publish'd*, may be of some good Use to many *honest* and *serious Christians*, that I do with great Chearfulness apply my self to the *Task* that still remains; humbly hoping for the Blessing of God, upon Endeavours most seriously intended, to promote the Honour  
A of

of *Christ's Religion*, and to illustrate the Dignity and Importance of his *Institutions*.

I AM now in the first Place to consider what you have given for the Sense of the Words of St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. in order to shew that they are not to be apply'd to the *Lord's Supper* \*.

THE Passage is this, — *Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; Therefore let us keep the Feast, not with the old Leaven, nor the Leaven of Malice and Wickedness, but with the unleavened Bread of Sincerity and Truth.*

YOU say, these Words “as directed to the *Corinthians* relate to their constant Behaviour as a Society of *Christians*, design'd by their Holy Religion, to be purged from all *Leaven*, or every Thing that could corrupt them: And that this constant Behaviour is represented under the Figure of their keeping a perpetual *Feast*, free from all *Leaven* of *Wickedness* or wicked Men.”

\* Pag. 94.

Now



Now I must observe here, that if your *Interpretation* should be allow'd to be *good*, it would little affect any Point in debate: Because, it being already fully prov'd in my *Second Part*, that *Repentance* and a sincere Resolution of *Amendment* are necessary Qualifications for a worthy partaking of the *Lord's Supper*, the *Preparation* there contend- ed for, will stand upon the same Founda- tion of Truth and Certainty, whether your Sense of these Words is right or no.

HOWEVER it may not be improper to consider what you have here advanc'd, that the *Reader* may see upon what very insuffi- cient Grounds you deny this *Passage* to re- late to this *Duty*, and to give Him a still farther Proof how little you are to be de- pended upon, as a Guide and Instructor in the true Sense of *Scripture*.

THE whole *Passage*, as it ought to have been laid before your Readers, stands thus,

1 Cor. 5. 6. — Know ye not that a little Leaven leaveneth the whole Lump?

7. Purge out therefore the old Leaven, that

A 2

ye

ye may be a new Lump, as ye are unleaven'd  
For even Christ our Passover is sacrific'd for us.

8. Therefore let us keep the Feast, not with  
old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Ma-  
lice and Wickedness, but with the unleaven'd  
Bread of Sincerity and Truth.

THE first Words of this *Passage* are  
brought by the *Apostle*, in support of the  
Directions He had been giving the Church  
of *Corinth* to excommunicate an incestuous  
Member. Because as a little Leaven leaven-  
eth the whole Lump, so 'twas likely that if  
this wicked Man should still continue in  
the Communion of the Church, He might  
by his *bad Example* corrupt other *Christians*.

AFTER so good a Reason given for  
this Act of *Discipline*, He then commands  
them to inflict it upon the Offender. *Purge  
out therefore the old Leaven*. Let not this  
corrupt Man remain among the *Faithfull*;  
and with Him, expel all *Malice* and *Wicked-  
ness* from your own Hearts, that ye may  
be a new Lump, "an intire uncorrupted  
Mass," *καθὼς ἐστὶ ἀζύμοι*, as ye are unleav-  
en'd, that is, being thus freed from this  
corrupt

corrupt Member, and from the Malice and Pollution of your own Hearts.

THIS is the plain Meaning of the Words that precede those you have quoted, and this you affirm your self, when you say, that "they relate to the constant Behaviour  
" of the *Corinthians*, design'd by their Holy  
" Religion to be purged from all *Leaven*,  
" or every Thing that could corrupt them,  
" ——— from all *Leaven* of Wickedness  
" or wicked Men." \*

NOW the Words with which you begin your *Quotation*, are brought by the *Apostle* as a Reason why they should thus become " *an intire uncorrupted new Lump* or "*Mafs*," and that is, *Because, ὑὸν γὰρ, For even*, or, *For indeed Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us*; and an excellent Reason it is; for if Christ died for our Sins, to free us from the Guilt and Punishment of 'em, nothing can be more absurd than to think of living any longer in them. We certainly therefore ought to be a *new Lump*, sincere and untainted, since it was the very

\* Pag. 94.

Purpose of *Christ's Sacrifice* to make us such.

THIS is the agreed Meaning of the *Figurative* Expressions here used, which being all allusive to the *Manner* of performing the *Jewish Passover*, (which was a Type of the *Christian*) are used with great Propriety, after mention had been made of excommunicating the *incestuous Corinthian*, under the Term of *purging out the old Leaven*. Well then, what follows? *Therefore let us keep the Feast, not with old Leaven, neither with the Leaven of Malice and Wickedness, but with the unleaven'd Bread of Sincerity and Truth.*

THEREFORE let us keep the Feast. —  
Whatever these Words mean, 'tis plain they are an Inference from the foregoing. We are therefore to keep the Feast, because *Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us*. The keeping the Feast then cannot possibly mean the constant Behaviour of *Christians*, in a general Course of *Purity* and *Religion*, because He had spoken of this before, and had argued for the Necessity of it, from  
this

this *Fact* of our *Lord's* having been *sacrificed for us*. Because the *Apostle* must then be charg'd with *Tautology*, and with *infering* the very same Thing from the *Sacrifice* of *Christ*, which He had immediately before prov'd from it. And his Reasoning put into a short *Form*, would stand thus.

YOUR constant Behaviour ought to be free from all Corruption, because *Christ is sacrificed for us*; Therefore our constant Behaviour ought to be free from all Corruption. —

Now certainly no Author should be interpreted as arguing in this Sort, unless there be an absolute necessity for it. But is there any such necessity here? Is not the Word, *ἑορτάζεν*, when understood to mean, as you understand it, the performing *the general Duty of a Christian throughout his whole Life*, very highly *Figurative*? and is this Use of it warranted by Example, or indeed is there one other single Instance to be named, where it was ever so used? These are certainly very good Reasons against this Acceptation of the *Word*, if there were  
no



no other; but when it moreover destroys the Force as well as Elegance of the *Apostle's* Reasoning, and makes Him prove the same Thing by the same *Medium* twice in the same Breath, it is intolerable to force such a Sense upon it.

BUT now, if we suppose the *Apostle* to be speaking here concerning the *Lord's Supper* under this Term, ἐσθ'α'ειν, besides that the Term does naturally and suitably express that eminent *Christian Feast*; and besides that the *Sacrifice* of Christ upon the *Cross* being just mention'd, the Commemoration thereof in his *Supper* would very naturally offer it self to the *Apostle's* Mind; besides all this, the Sense of the Word does most exactly and appositely suit with the Design and Construction of the whole *Passage*. For the *Apostle's* Reasoning may be thus rightly represented.

ALL Christians ought in their constant Behaviour, to keep themselves free from the Pollutions of Sin, because Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us, that He might redeem us from all Iniquity. And for the same

same Reason we ought *especially* to keep the great *Christian Feast* instituted by Christ Himself in Remembrance of *that Sacrifice*, with all *Purity* and *Sincerity*, and with all that freedom from *Malice* and *Wickedness*, of which the unleaven'd Bread in the Jewish Passover was a *Type* and *Emblem*.

THE Argument is what the Logicians call *Argumentum à fortiori*, -and it is *clear*, *easy* and *conclusive*. And from hence ariseth a new Proof of the Necessity of a *previous Examination* before the partaking of the *Holy Mysteries*, that *Christians* may approve themselves to their own Consciences; that they do approach the *Holy Table* in *Seriousness* and *Truth*, without *Guile*, and without *Hypocrisy*. You allow, that if these Words do "relate to the *Lord's Supper*, they "teach us, that we ought to partake of " *this*, which is our *Paschal Feast*, with such "sincere, untainted, honest Hearts as "become *Christians*:" \* and I think, after what has been so largely urged by me in my *Second Part*, upon this Point, I may securely leave it with every intelligent *Reader*,

\* Pag. 94.

whether this can be done, otherwise than with Penitence for *past* Failures, and a sincere Resolution of Amendment for the *future*.

YOU next come to a *Passage* in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*\* Chap. 13. v. 10. — *We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, who serve the Tabernacle.* Here you venture to affirm, that “as there  
“ is not one *Interpreter* ancient or modern  
“ of great Note, who interprets this obscure *Passage* of the Lord’s Table; so  
“ there is not one good Reason for such  
“ an Interpretation, but many against it,  
“ and particularly the whole Tenor and  
“ Scope of the Writer.”

YOU have been already so well chastised for the Boldness and Groundlessness of this Assertion, by several learned Persons who are beforehand with me in their Answers to what you have said upon this *Passage*, that I think it needless to add any Thing to what they have offer’d.

\* Pag. 96.

I SHALL only observe, that if the *Passage* be indeed *obscure*, as you say it is, you have help'd very little towards the clearing it, and that after all your puzzled Reasoning upon it, it appears still evident, from the plain and obvious Import of the Words, that Christians have an *Altar* of which the *Jews* have no right to partake, and that *Christians* are to eat from this *Altar*, and that this is represented as a Matter of Privilege and Benefit superior to what the *Jews* enjoy'd from their *Altar*; and consequently, that whether this be in strictness an *Altar*, or rather a *Holy Table*, whether there be a real Offering of Bread and Wine thereon under the Notion of a proper commemorative Sacrifice, or the Bread and Wine are exhibited to us as the Memorials of Christ's Body and Bloud, since they are to be eaten and drunk by us in *Remembrance* of his Passion, this Action of eating and drinking them from the *Holy Table* appears from this *Passage* to be as certainly the Means of Admission to the Grace and Benefits of the *Christian* Covenant, as the partaking of the *Jewish* Altar, was the Means of partaking of the Benefits of the *Jewish*.

“ THERE is a long Discourse” you tell us, “ of our Blessed Saviour’s, in the sixth Chapter of St. *John’s* Gospel, about *eating his Flesh* and *drinking his Bloud*, which many have labour’d much, to interpret concerning the *Lord’s Supper*; especially since the absurd Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, and other dark and unintelligible Notions, have been brought into this Subject.†

ONE would imagine by this Representation of the Matter, that the *Romanists* do universally interpret this *Passage* concerning the Holy *Eucharist*; and that it is the avowed Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, establish’d by one or more of their *Councils*, that it ought to be *so interpreted*; and yet, as this is deny’d and oppos’d by several eminent Doctors of the Church of *Rome*, particularly by Cardinal *Cajetan* \*, so the Council of *Trent* it self†, after sundry Debates about it, thought proper to *decide* nothing more concerning the Design and Meaning of this Discourse, than that our Lord’s in-

† Pag. 100.

\* Comment. in Vers. 53. Cap. 6. S. *Joann.*

† Council. Trid. Sess. 21. Cap. 1.

joining



joining the *Communion* in both kinds, could not be rightly gather'd from it.

IT is therefore unbecoming a *Christian* and a *Scholar*, thus to *insinuate*, that they who interpret this Discourse of our Blessed *Saviour's* as meant of the *Lord's Supper*, do therein join with the *Romanists* in the Sense of it; because as it is an *Insinuation* without Ground, so it can serve no other End, but that of prejudicing your *Readers*, against listening to such an *Interpretation*, how just soever in it self, and of how great Consequence soever for directing us to the true Design of that *Rite*, the *Nature* and *End* of which you profess to shew.

YOU next assert, that "there is no Appearance that this *Passage* was understood " in the very first Days of the Church to " concern this *Rite*."\*

NOW here you ought to have supported this Assertion by some kind of Proof; particularly, you ought to have examin'd and confuted what you must know has been offer'd to the *Publick* by *learned Men*, to shew

\* Pag. 100.

that

that it *was* the undoubted Opinion of the *Ancients*, that this Passage of *St. John* is to be understood of the Holy Eucharist.

THE Persons you undertake to instruct had a Right to this: And you have failed in your Obligations to them in omitting to do it. And unless you think your bare Word is to pass with them for Demonstration, how is it that you have in this discharg'd your Promise, of enabling them *immediately to see, whether what you have laid down does convey to them the true Notions of this Duty or not?* \*

A GREAT deal depends upon this *Passage*; Because, tho' the weakness of your *Scheme*, may be sufficiently shewn without calling in the Aid of it, yet, if this *Passage* be indeed to be understood as describing the Use and Benefits of the *Lord's Supper*, your whole *Treatise* is demolish'd at once; your Doctrine concerning this *Holy Ordinance* is apparently as false, as Scripture is true.

\* Pag. 2.

It was incumbent therefore upon you, to have prov'd what you have here asserted, and to have confuted the contrary Opinion, that has, with so much Learning, Strength and Perspicuity been maintain'd by the late Excellent and Learned Mr. *Johnson* in his Book intituled *The unbloudy Sacrifice*, before you had taken upon you so confidently to affirm, what has hitherto been so insufficiently maintain'd by the most learned Advocates for your Side of the Question.

THO' after all, it ill becomes you to take any Advantage from what might or might not be the Sense of the Church in any Age of it since the Times of the *Evangelists* and *Apostles*, concerning this or any other *Passage* of *Scripture*. Because since you have precluded all Arguments against your *Scheme* that depend upon the Judgment of any of the *Ancients*, or all of 'em \*, it is really unjust in you to endeavour to give weight to any *Interpretation* of *Scripture*, for the *Support* of your *Scheme*, from the suppos'd Judgment of those *very Writers*,

\* Prop. V.

whose

whose Authority you had before so disdainfully rejected.

BUT do we then decline the Trial of this Point by an Appeal to the Sense of the *Church in the very first Days of it*? Very far from it. For my own Part, I should much suspect any *Interpretation* of any *Passage* of Scripture whatsoever that could not bear this Test. But Issue has already been join'd, by very able and learned Men\*, and the Fruits of their Inquiries are in the Hands of many, and to them I appeal for the Truth of what I assert, in direct Opposition to what you have here advanc'd†, — *That there is no Appearance, that this PASSAGE was understood in the very first Days of the Church to concern this Rite.*

YOU then proceed and say, “ whoever  
“ will seriously consider the *whole* of it,  
“ will presently find, that it could not re-

\* See Dr. *Claget's* Paraphrase upon the 6th Chapter of *St. John*.

Dr. *Whitby's* Comment.

Mr. *Johnson's* Unbloody Sacrifice.

† Pag. 100.

“ late to a *Duty*, which was not then instituted, nor so much as hinted at, to his *Disciples*.”

I CANNOT apprehend the Reason of your adding the last Words — “ nor so much as hinted at, to his *Disciples*.” For is not this the very Point now under inquiry? We would know whether what is here so largely discours’d of, concerns the *Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*. No certainly, say you, for there is not the *least Hint* concerning it.

THIS seems to me a *Petitio Principii* of the grossest Kind, and is certainly a great *Solecism* in Argument. I say this indeed upon the Supposition of your really meaning what your Words appear to signify, which is, that our *Lord did not*, at the Time He made this *Discourse*, so much as hint at his *Supper*.

BUT if you will say, that you only meant, that our *Saviour* had not before this *Discourse* either *instituted*, or *hinted at his Supper*, to his *Disciples*; and that you think this *Discourse*

C

could



could not have been understood by the *Disciples*, unless they had received some previous Instructions. concerning the supposed Subject of it : By this means you clear your self indeed of the former Charge, but the Reason you ground your Argument upon, seems very insufficient. For admitting that the *Disciples* could not have fully comprehended our Saviour's *Discourse* in this *Passage*, yet if they did but apprehend Him in general to speak of a Religious Rite to be instituted afterwards, in which something was to be *eaten* and *drunk* under the Notion of his *Body* and *Bloud*, this would have been a sufficient Reason for our Saviour's making it, for *their* greater Certainty of taking his Design, when He should come to *institute* that Rite. And this is agreeable to our Saviour's Method of instructing his *Disciples* in other Points of Consequence. So particularly, when He spoke concerning the Resurrection of his Body, under these Figurative Words — *Destroy this Temple, and in three Days I will raise it up*, how little soever his *Disciples* then understood his Meaning — The Text says expressly *Joh. 2. 22. When — He was risen from the Dead,*  
his

*his Disciples remember'd that He had said this unto them, and they believ'd the Scripture, and the Word which Jesus had said. These Words then, "not so much as hinted at", might have very well been spared; for which Reason I will now repeat your Argument without this Addition.*

"WHOEVER will seriously consider  
 " the whole of it [this Passage] will pre-  
 " sently find that it could not relate to a  
 " Duty which was not then instituted —  
 " but was indeed only a very high *Figura-*  
 " *tive* Representation to the *Jews* then a-  
 " bout Him, of their Duty and Obligation  
 " to receive into their Hearts, and digest  
 " his whole Doctrine, as the Food and Life  
 " of their Souls."

THIS is your Opinion, and you next proceed to prove and support it.

AND this you attempt, First, from the Difference of Expression to be observ'd in this *Passage*, from what is used in the Words of the *Institution*.

SECONDLY, from the Difference of Time, when the eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Bloud is commanded to be done in this *Passage*, from that when the Duty of the *Lord's Supper* was to be perform'd.

THIRDLY, from the Sense in which the best Interpreters have understood it.

FOURTHLY, from our Blessed Saviour's own Interpretation of these Words.

FIRST, you say, "the Difference of Expression in the two Cases helps to shew, that this *Passage* does not relate to the *Lord's Supper* \*." You observe that in the Institution of the *Lord's Supper*, our Saviour says, "The *Bread* which you are to eat in this *Rite* is my *Body*": Not, "my *Body* or *Flesh* is your *Bread*, or your *Food*." "The *Wine* which you are to drink at my Table is my *Bloud*," not, "my *Bloud* is your *Wine*, or your *drink*."

\* Pag. 101.

WE

WE have here a most rare Example of a nice, fine-spun kind of Reasoning, that I am apt to think, common Understandings will not be able to comprehend. Indeed the Argument is so exquisitely nice, that I acknowledge I can by no means discern the Force of it, tho' I have consider'd it well and thoroughly, and have turn'd it every Way. You do not say, and I think you cannot possibly mean, that these Propositions tho' different in Sound, and order of Words, are any way different in Sense and Meaning. For sure it is perfectly the same Thing to say, "The Bread you are to eat, is my Body," as to say, "my Body is the Bread you are to eat."

YOUR Argument then rests not upon any suppos'd Difference in the Sense of these *Propositions*, but upon the Difference of *Expression*, or rather the Difference of the *order* in which the Words lye in the two *Propositions*. But this is building upon a very fallacious Bottom; and such a Subtilty as this can never support an Argument in any Cause whatsoever. Nor was it I believe ever before argued by any Man,

Man, that such a minute Change, whether in the order of Words, or in the Words themselves, or in both, when no Change in the Sense was introduced thereby, cou'd alone be a Reason to suspect whether they were meant of the same Thing. Other Circumstances indeed there are many, that may make it necessary, to understand the self *same* Expressions to be meant of *different* Things, and to be referr'd to quite different Subjects. But a bare Change of the *order* of the Words, or even of the Words *themselves*, where the Sense of them remains the *same*, can have no Power to do this. And this is so self evident, that it can need no Examples for farther Illustration.

I WILL however give *one*, and that it may have its due Weight with *you*, as well as *others*, it shall be in your own Words, as they are laid down by you in this very *Treatise*, in direct Opposition to the Ground of your present Argument,

YOU tell us, *with Regard to the Cup* in the Institution, that *two of the sacred Writers*, report the Words to have been, *this is*  
*my*



*my Bloud of the New Testament, or rather Covenant, the other two say, this Cup is the new Covenant in my Bloud. Which of the two, you add, was the very Expression, is of little Importance, since they both tend to the same End, and design the same Thing\*.*

HERE, it seems, in the Account of the *Institution* it self, a variety of Expression is of little Importance; since the different Words *tend to the same End, and design the same Thing*, it is all one as if they were the *same*. But if this is true here, (as it undoubtedly is) will it not hold as well in every other Case? How then comes it to pass, that a Diversity of Expression in the 6th Chapter of St. *John*, from what is found in the Words of the *Institution*, should make it necessary to refer them to different Subjects, tho' the Sense of them is allow'd to be perfectly the same?

YOU are not at Liberty here to say, that the different Expressions do not *tend to the same End, and design the same Thing*. For that is the Matter in *Debate*; and you

are to *prove*, that they do not *tend to the same End*, and *design the same Thing*. But when you attempt to do this barely from the Diversity of Expression observable in the different Places abovemention'd, you act in Defiance of your own *Maxim*, before quoted, which is, that a variety of Expression is of little, that is, (as you apparently mean) of no Importance in the Case, because the Words may notwithstanding that variety, *tend to the same End, and design the same Thing*.

WHETHER they do or no, is the Point in debate, and must be determin'd by other Arguments; but your own Words are *demonstrative* against your self, that the diversity of Expression is of *little*, that is, *no Importance*, in the Case.

How you came to form an Argument so inconsistent with the common Rules of Reasoning, and with your own Opinion, so clearly deliver'd before, I am not concern'd to know. But as I cannot but say, that the *oddness* and *novelty* of the Argument put me upon considering which way  
it

it might get into your Head; so, I believe the Reader will excuse me for laying my Guess before Him, especially if what follows may be farther useful towards clearing the Point we are upon.

Now it is to be observ'd, that this *difference of Expression* has been taken Notice of by some of the best of our Writers against Popery, and very good Use has been made of it against the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*. This, 'tis likely, deceiv'd you into an Opinion, that it might be helpful to you in your *Design* also. And in such a scarcity of *Arguments* as there is on your Side of the *Question*, it cannot be wonder'd at, that you should catch at every Thing that had any Appearance of serving your Cause. But it was a great oversight in you not to consider, that you are not arguing against *Transubstantiation*, but against this *Passage's* being in any Sense to be apply'd to *the Lord's Supper*. For this View of the Matter discovers the Ground of your Mistake. 'Tis well known, the *Romanists* found their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* upon the *Letter* of the Words of the *Institution*,

*stitution*, and endeavour to confirm the justness of that *Literal Construction*, from these Words in St. *John*, where, our Saviour tells the Multitude that they must *eat his Flesh*, and that *his Flesh is Meat indeed* — Now it is very pertinently alledg'd against them, that there being a difference of Expression used upon these different Occasions, if the Words are to be taken *literally* in both Cases, the Meaning of the *Propositions* will be different. So that if in the Words of the *Institution*, the *Bread* is to be understood to be chang'd into the true *natural Body* or *Flesh* of *Christ*, then from this *Passage* in St. *John* we shall be taught, that his *Flesh* or *Body* is converted into *Meat* or *Bread*; which is plainly quite another Kind of Change, and is directly contrary to the Notion of the *Romanists*, and to the Decisions of their Church, concerning the Sense of the Words of the *Institution*.

So that here the Argument concludes with full Force, and nothing sensible can be reply'd to it. But the Matter before you, was not whether there be any such *Change* of the *Elements* to be prov'd from  
this

this *Passage*, but whether this *Passage* has any Relation to the *Lord's Supper* at all. And in this different State of the *Question*, and this Alteration of the *Subject*, the Force of the Argument is alter'd also, and what concluded right before, is now of *no Importance* at all in the Case. And this, as it is plain in it self, so you have, as I just now shew'd, fully and in strong Terms acknowledg'd to be so.

So that I have now your own Authority for rejecting this first Argument as impertinent to the Point in hand.

2. SECONDLY, you argue against this *Passage's* being to be understood of the *Lord's Supper* from the *difference of Time*, when the *Flesh* and *Bloud* here mention'd was to be *eaten* and *drunk*, from the Time when the *Duty* of the *Lord's Supper* was to be perform'd.

FOR you say, "In the Discourse in St. *John*, our Saviour says not one Word of eating his *Flesh*, or drinking his *Bloud* in Remembrance of Him, after He should



“ be taken from them; but is exhorting  
 “ them to the *eating* his *Flesh*, and *drink-*  
 “ *ing* his *Bloud* at the very Time of his  
 “ speaking to them.”\*

FROM whence you argue that “ this  
 “ cannot relate to the Celebration of a  
 “ *Memorial* of his Sufferings, a long Time  
 “ afterwards; which could not be put in  
 “ Practice during his Presence with them;  
 “ but to the *eating* his *Flesh*, and *drinking*  
 “ his *Bloud*, in a Sense consistent with do-  
 “ ing it, even at the Time whilst He was  
 “ living and present, as well as after his  
 “ Death, and that can be no other than  
 “ receiving Him, by receiving his Doctrine,  
 “ as the Food and Nourishment of their  
 “ Souls.”

NOW notwithstanding that Caution and  
 Subtilty which your Advocates think they  
 find throughout your Performance, you are  
 here *again* guilty of such an *Inconsistency*  
 with your self, as one would not have ex-  
 pected from a Person of ordinary *Care*, or  
 common *Skill* in writing. For the Stress

\* Pag. 101.

of your Argument here rests, as your last did, upon a *Circumstance*, which you have before, with *Repetition*, and great *Assurance* affirm'd, is of no Weight at all in the Case.

YOU here suppose that our *Saviour ex-horts his Disciples to the eating his Flesh and drinking his Bloud, at the very Time of his speaking to them*, and from this suppos'd speaking in the *Present Tense*, you infer, that what He said, *cannot relate to a Celebration of a Memorial of his Sufferings, which could not be put in Practice, during his Presence with them.*

NOW whether this Supposition is rightly founded or not, shall be consider'd presently, in the mean time you have effectually precluded its serving your Purpose; For you have these express Words in your *Paraphrase upon the Institution.*

“ TAKE, and eat this Bread now broken,  
 “ which I call my Body, at this Time con-  
 “ sider'd by me as actually given, broken and  
 “ depriv'd of Life for your good; tho' NOT  
 “ YET DONE, as you certainly know, who  
 “ now

“ now see me. But I now give you this  
 “ *Bread*, and call it my *Body*, in order to  
 “ shew you, that you are to *take*, and *eat*  
 “ *Bread* in this Manner, AFTER MY  
 “ DEATH, and to introduce my Command  
 “ to you to *do this; to break and eat Bread*  
 “ *in Remembrance of me*, and of my *Body*  
 “ broken, after it SHALL be broken, and  
 “ after I SHALL BE REMOVED from you.”\*

YOU repeat the same Thing with regard  
 to the *Cup* — And you urge it again when  
 you explain the Reason of the Cup's being  
 stiled the *New Covenant* in Christ's Blood.  
 — Now I suppose the difference of *twelve*  
*Months* and *two Months*, can make no *ma-*  
*terial* Alteration in these two Cases. So  
 that, if our Saviour could with *Propriety*,  
 express himself in the *Present Tense*, *take*,  
*eat* this *Bread*, which I call my *Body* in *Re-*  
*membrance* of me, and yet did not mean  
 the *present* Time, but design'd to be under-  
 stood as directing his *Disciples* what they  
 were to do after He was to be *removed*  
*from them* into Heaven above six Weeks  
 afterwards, I conceive the *Propriety* will be

\* Pag. 19, 20.

exactly the same, if what He express'd to his Followers in his *Discourse* recorded in the 6th of St. *John*, in the Present Tense, as then *immediately* to be done, was however not *really* to be done, till a Year afterwards.

THAT the *present* Time is often express'd when the *future* is meant, cannot be deny'd, but then it must be also granted, that such Expressions are full as applicable to *remoter* Events, as to what are somewhat *nearer*, and that a *little* Difference in the Time, can make no Change in the *Fitness* and *Propriety* of them.

How you came therefore to build so much upon a *Circumstance* in one Case, which you suppose to have no Manner of Weight in *another* of the self same Kind, is a Matter you must account for, when you are at leisure, and are able to do it.

IN the mean time, till you have reconcil'd this *Inconsistency*, I must look upon what you have advanc'd here, to be effectually answer'd by your self, and of how  
little

little Weight soever all other *Authorities* are with you, that is *one* you cannot except to.

BUT, after all, as this Way of *Interpretation* is forc'd and unnatural, with regard to the Words of the *Institution*, so there is no manner of occasion for it in this *Passage* of *St. John*. For our Blessed *Saviour* plainly speaks here of the *future* Time, when He makes mention of *the Meat that endureth unto Everlasting Life*, by which Meat He explains Himself so often to mean his *Flesh* or his *Body*.

*Joh. 6. 27. Labour not, says He, for the Meat that perisbeth, but for that Meat which endureth unto Everlasting Life, which the Son of Man SHALL give unto you\*.*

And afterwards.

*51. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread, He shall live for ever.*

*And the Bread that I WILL give, is my*

\* Τὴν βρῶσιν — ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰμῶν δώσει.



*Flesh, which I WILL give for the Life of the World.\**

NOTHING can be plainer, than that *the Meat which endureth to Everlasting Life, the living Bread which came down from Heaven*, was not then actually given, when our Saviour made this *Discourse*, because it was then made the Subject of a *Promise*. *The Meat which endureth unto Everlasting Life — The Son of Man SHALL give unto you. — And the Bread that I WILL give, — I WILL give for the Life of the World.*

AND altho' it is allow'd, that many particulars of our Saviour's *Discourse*, do relate to what was *then* and *immediately* to be put in Practice by his *Disciples*; yet, what is any where said concerning *Meat, Drink, Flesh, Bloud*, as given by Him for the Use and Benefit of the World, is either *expressly* or by easy *Construction* represented as *Future*, and not then *actually* given: So far is it from being true, that this *Discourse* cannot relate to the Celebration of a Memorial of his

\* Καὶ ὁ ἄριστος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δίδωμι, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣ ἐγὼ δίδωμι ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

*Sufferings a long Time [that is a Year] afterwards.*

3. THIRDLY, you endeavour to support your Opinion concerning this *Passage*, by affirming, that *the best Interpreters have thus understood it.*

I MUST here *again* complain, of this unjustifiable Way, of pretending *Vouchers* for your Opinions, without either telling us *who* they are, or *what* their *Testimonies* are, to which we are to have such regard.

IF I can guess at your *Sentiments* by your *Manner* of writing, all this Appearance of regard to the Judgment of Interpreters is mere *Grimace*. And you would not only reject with *Scorn* all *Authorities* that should, in such an indiscriminate Manner, be forc'd upon you, but would even laugh at all *Human* Testimony whatsoever, that should be alledg'd against any Sense of *Scripture*, you, in your own Judgment, think to be right. Whenever therefore, you pretend *Authority* for your Opinions, and especially in so very loose and general a way, as you do here,  
your

your Conduct is justly to be blam'd, by thus passing that for an Argument upon your *Readers*, in *favour* of your Opinion, that you would not allow to be of any Weight *against* it.

BUT do not from hence run away with the *Notion*, that I allow what you affirm. No: The Truth of Fact is intirely against you, as might be easily and fully made appear, if it was at all needful to enter upon a particular *Computation*.

4. FOURTHLY, your last Argument for the Truth of your *Interpretation*, is, that our *Saviour* himself has *interpreted* his own *Discourse*, just as you do. Your Words follow.

“ WHAT puts the Matter beyond all  
 “ doubt, thus our *Blessed Lord*, at the End  
 “ of that *Discourse*, plainly interprets them  
 “ himself *viz.* v. 63. where, upon the  
 “ gross Misapprehensions of his Followers,  
 “ He does not express himself thus to  
 “ them —— I mean by these Sayings,  
 “ which some of you think so hard, your

“ partaking of a Religious *Institution*, in  
 “ Memory of my *Body* and *Bloud*, after my  
 “ Death. — Which He would unavoid-  
 “ ably have done, had this been his Mean-  
 “ ing. But on the contrary, He explains  
 “ himself thus — The Words which I  
 “ speak unto you, the *Doctrines* I teach,  
 “ for which I shall suffer in the *Flesh*, and  
 “ which I shall seal with my *Bloud*: *These*  
 “ are the Things I mean, which I have  
 “ talk’d of, under the Notion of *Meat* and  
 “ *Drink*, to nourish you to Eternal Life,  
 “ *These Words* are *Spirit*, and these are the  
 “ *Life* I have been speaking of, and these,  
 “ if you will receive them, shall be *vital*  
 “ Food ro you.” “ A Manner of Explica-  
 “ tion, you add, which our *Blessed Lord*  
 “ could not, you humbly presume, have  
 “ made use of, had He ever design’d this  
 “ Discourse to be understood of his future  
 “ Institution of the *Lord’s Supper* \*.

INDEED I think the same. But is this  
*Explication* our Lord’s? Is it not your own?  
 And is it not *intirely* your own? And have  
 you not presum’d to give Words and Mean-

ings for our Saviour's, which have no Foundation in the Gospel?

THE Words, of which you give the *Paraphrase* above, for the true and certain Meaning, are these; *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing: The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life* \*. Does our *Blessed Saviour* say one Syllable here, of what you have foisted in as a Part of the Explication He gives of the Design of his Discourse to the People, when you represent Him saying, — “The  
“ DOCTRINES I teach, for which I shall  
“ suffer in the Flesh; THESE are the Things  
“ I mean, which I have talk'd of, under  
“ the Notion of Meat and Drink.”?

WHAT is this but to give that for the certain and agreed Meaning of these Words, which is the very *Point in Question*, and for the *Proof* of which, every Thing that is alledg'd by you, upon this Head, ought to have been directed?

\* V. 63.



THE Matter of Inquiry is, whether our *Saviour* has explain'd Himself in such a Manner, that his *Explication* is inconsistent with the Supposition of his speaking in this *Discourse* concerning the *Lord's Supper*. Now, you, without inquiring, what others have written upon the Matter, without examining the Context, without supporting your *Interpretation* by one single Reason, represent *Him* expressly saying — that his DOCTRINES were the Things He meant and talk'd of, under the Notion of Meat and Drink; and then you *securely* argue, that He could not mean a quite different Thing from what you suppose Him to have affirm'd He did mean. But what is this but another *Petition Principii*? Our *Saviour*, say you, does not speak of his *Last Supper*, because He speaks of his *Doctrines* only. When you have prov'd this to have been the Case, the Argument will conclude; but till you do this, which you have not yet attempted, the Matter rests just where it did. And you are not advanc'd one single Step, towards your Conclusion.

AND

AND so I have done with your four *Arguments* against understanding this Discourse of our *Lord* concerning his *Last Supper*; and I think I have shewn them all to be *weak* and *fallacious*. For which Reason I cannot but think the Words, with which you shut up this *Head*, to be very extraordinary, when you say —

“ THIS *Passage* therefore of St. *John's Gospel*, I purposely omit, as not relating “ to the present Subject.”\* For certainly your Resolution to omit it, is as rash, as the *Premisses* from which you draw your *Conclusion*, are weak and insufficient; so that I cannot but look upon it as an Instance of extraordinary Assurance, where more *Modesty* would have better suited the Importance of the Subject. For I do not despair of convincing every impartial *Reader*, before I have done, that this *Passage* does not only relate to the present Subject, but that it is a most noble Proof of the *Doctrine* I am defending, and of the Falshood of your whole *Scheme*. Before I enter upon the Point, it is proper to lay the

\* Pag. 103.

whole *Passage* before the Reader, which is as follows.

*Joh. 6. 26. Jesus answer'd them and said, verily, verily I say unto you, ye seek me, not because ye saw the Miracles, but because ye did eat of the Loaves, and were filled.*

*27. Labour not for the Meat which perisheth, but for that Meat which endureth unto Everlasting Life, which the Son of Man shall give unto you: For Him hath God the Father sealed.*

*28. Then said they unto Him, what shall we do, that we might work the Works of God?*

*29. Jesus answer'd and said unto them, this is the Work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He hath sent.*

*30. They said therefore unto Him, what Sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? What dost thou work?*

*31. Our Fathers did eat Manna in the Desert; as it is written, He gave them Bread from Heaven to eat.*

*32. Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that Bread from Heaven, but my Father giveth you the true Bread from Heaven.*

33. For the Bread of God is He which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World.

34. Then said they unto Him, Lord, evermore give us this Bread.

35. And Jesus said unto them, I am the Bread of Life: He that cometh to me shall never hunger, and He that believeth on me, shall never thirst.

---

47. Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting Life.

48. I am that Bread of Life.

49. Your Fathers did eat Manna in the Wilderness, and are dead.

50. This is the Bread which cometh down from Heaven, that a Man may eat thereof, and not die.

51. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven: If any Man eat of this Bread, He shall live for ever: And the Bread that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World.

52. The Jews therefore strove amongst themselves saying, how can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?

53. Then Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Bloud, ye have no Life in you.

54. Whoso eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Bloud, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last Day.

55. For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Bloud is drink indeed.

56. He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Bloud, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

57. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : So, He that eateth me, even He shall live by me.

58. This is that Bread which came down from Heaven : not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are dead ; He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever.

59. These Things said He in the Synagogue, as He taught in Capernaum.

60. Many therefore of his Disciples, when they had heard this, said, this is an hard Saying, who can hear it ?

61. When Jesus knew in himself, that his Disciples murmured at it, He saith unto them, doth this offend you ?



62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where He was before?*

63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing: The Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.*

Now I desire it may be consider'd

I. FIRST, that if this *Discourse* does not relate to the *Lord's Supper*, there is no Appearance, that this *Evangelist* has ever once hinted at this great Duty of the *Christian Religion*, in the Principles, End and Design whereof, it was his Purpose to instruct the World by his *Gospel*.

It is allow'd, and we have the concurrent Testimony of several of the most ancient Writers of the Christian Church, that St. *John* wrote his *Gospel* the last of the four, to supply the *Church* with a fuller Account of the *Divinity* of *Christ*, than had been before given, and with a distinct Recital of many of those *Heavenly* and most *instructive* Discourses, and some of those *Miracles* and other Occurrences, that had been pass'd over in Silence by the other

*Evangelists* \*. And for this Reason, we may observe, there are not many Things mention'd by him, that were particularly taken notice of before. But then it is also to be observ'd, that the Exercise of his Divine Power of working *Miracles*, the Circumstances of his Death and Sufferings, the Particulars of his Resurrection, as also the End and Design of both, together with the Effects and Necessity of the Descent of the Holy Spirit, and the Certainty of the future Rewards and Punishments, with some other important Articles, are all very distinctly recounted by him, notwithstanding what is related concerning them by the rest.

\* Τὸν μὲν περὶ Ἰωάννου ἔχατον συνιδόντα ὅτι τὰ σωματικὰ ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις διδωλὼτα· ὡς τραπεζήν τι ὑπὸ τῷ γνωρίῳ, πνεύματι θεοφορηθέντα, πνευματικὴν ποιῶσιν εὐαγγέλιον. *Clem. Alex. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. L. 6. Cap. 14.*

Παρακληθέντα ——— φασὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην τὸν ὑπὸ τῷ ὡσείων εὐαγγελιστῶν παρακληθέντα χρόνῳ, καὶ τὰ κατὰ τῆτον περιγραφέντα τῷ σωτήρι (πάντα δ' ἦν τὰ πρὸ τῆς τοῦ Βαπτισμοῦ καδείξεως) τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλια παραδίδειν.

*Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. Cap. 24.*

ΤίτартⓈ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἐλθὼν ὁ μακάριⓈ [Ἰωάννης ὁ εὐαγγελιστῆς] πρῶτⓈ μὲν ὧν, ὑπερⓈ ἢ πρὸς τὸν εὐαγγελιστῆν, τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ καλῶς περιγραφέντα ὅσα ἐμνήμηνται ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ ἐπελάμβανεν τῶν ῥημάτων τὰ μὴ ῥηθέντα.

*Ephr. Har. 51. §. 19.*

So that, it does not at all seem likely, that so very important a Duty of *Christianity* as this is, and so necessary to be observ'd of all serious *Disciples of Christ*, should be wholly omitted, by any one of those, who profess to write an Account of what *Jesus did*, and what *He taught*, especially since we know *St. Paul* thought it necessary to give a particular History of the *Institution*, tho' done with the greatest Punctuality, by others before.

'T IS true indeed, *St. John* does not particularly mention the *Institution* of the other *Sacrament of Baptism*, any more than He does this of the *Lord's Supper*. But it is well to be observ'd, that in the *Discourse* which He records to have been held with *Nicodemus*, our blessed Saviour instructs Him in the Nature of *Regeneration*, by the use of Expressions, that plainly intimate his Design of instituting the *Rite of Baptism*\*, as the Means of that *New Birth* He was then speaking of; and a short view of what our Saviour says to him, may afford some light to the Argument in hand.

\* *Joh. 3.*

WHEN this *Master in Israel* express'd his surprize at our Saviour's telling him, that, *unless a Man was born again, He could not enter into the Kingdom of God\**, absurdly understanding Him in the Sense of a *natural Birth*; our Saviour answers, by asserting the same Thing still more strongly, but adding withal an Explication of his Meaning in these Words—*Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a Man be born of Water and of the Spirit, He cannot enter into the Kingdom of God†.*

Now as this Answer evidently shews, that the *New Birth*, of which our Saviour spake, was to be accomplish'd thro' the Means of *Water* and the *Holy Spirit*, so has it also been universally understood as a Description of the entrance into *Christ's Church* by *Baptism*; and that, tho' our Saviour meant to check *Nicodemus's* gross conceit of a *Natural Birth*, as intended by our Saviour's first Words to Him; yet that He spoke of a true and a *real washing* with *Water*; and that altho' this was in order to a *Spiritual Effect*,

\* V. 3.

† V. 5.

yet that it was it self to be *materially* perform'd, as necessary thereunto.

AND from this consideration two Things offer themselves; which are very pertinent to the present Point.

1. FIRST, we hence see a Reason why our *Saviour* at the same Time that He warns his *Disciples* against the *gross* Conceptions they had entertain'd, might however mean to teach them, that, altho' they were not to *eat* his *real Flesh*, and *drink* his *real Bloud*; yet that the *Benefits* He was speaking of, were still to be convey'd by *oral eating and drinking*, and an *actual* and *material* Participation of something, that should be in *Virtue* and *Effect* his *Flesh* and *Bloud*.

FOR this is the very same Manner of speaking which He before used concerning the other *Sacrament* of *Baptism*; when He affirms, that the *New Birth* He then spoke of, was to be wrought by the *Holy Spirit* thro' the use of an *external* and *visible washing* with *Water*.



2. SECONDLY, since it is not reasonable to suppose, that our *Evangelist* should wholly omit the mention of *either* of the two Sacraments; and since it is allow'd to have been his Design, to supply what had been pass'd over by the other *sacred* Writers, and in order to that, *does* give an Account of a *Discourse* concerning *Baptism*, which more particularly explains the Purpose and Effects of it, than is done in the Accounts of the *Institution* thereof, recorded by the rest; it appears highly probable, that *this Discourse* under Consideration is of the like Kind, and that it is recorded by St. *John* for the Instruction of the *Church*, as a fuller Explication of the Use and *Benefits* of the *Lord's Supper*, than is contain'd in what the other *Evangelists* relate, in the short Accounts they give of the *Institution* of it.

Now here I would not be misunderstood, as ascribing more to what I have here argued, than it will prove. And for this Reason, I desire *you* and the *Reader* will observe, that I only contend from hence for a *likelihood* that this *Passage* does relate

to the *Lord's Supper*, and that I urge it no farther than as a Reason for a close Attention to the *Passage*, and that we ought to be guarded against any *Constructions* of it, that will exclude such a *Relation*, till we find such *Constructions* necessary, and that we cannot clear the Sense and Design of the *Passage* without admitting them.

AND I think what is above urged, will at least justify such a Conclusion.

II. I OBSERVE Secondly, that since there is no Appearance that our *Saviour* did at the Time of the *Institution*, explain the Design of this *Ordinance* to his Disciples, in any other Manner than by the Words of the *Institution*; or that the *Disciples* did ask any Questions about the Meaning and Purpose of it, it should seem as if they could not then be *first* inform'd concerning it.

THE Time when it was instituted, and the Circumstances that attended it, must lead them to think it an Act of Religion, that would be follow'd by at least as beneficial *Effects*, as those they expected from

G

their

their *Feast of the Passover*; but this would be far from letting them into so full an Understanding of the End and Design of it, as they seem to have had from their asking no kind of Questions concerning it.

Now this difficulty quite vanishes, if the *Discourse* recorded by St. *John*, was understood by them not as directing a *Belief* in Him and his *Doctrines* only, but as requiring them to *eat* and to *drink* somewhat, under the Notion of its being *spiritually* his *Body* and *Bloud*.

For this would have been so lively a *Comment* upon what they saw Him do, and heard Him command, at the *Institution* of this *Ordinance*, that, dull as they too commonly were, in seeing the *spiritual* Design of their *Lord's Discourses*, they could in this Particular be at no loss for his Meaning, and consequently could be under no kind of Necessity, to desire any farther Instruction therein. From these two Reasons together I think we may venture to affirm, that there is a high Probability that this *Discourse* has a Relation to the great Duty  
which

which is the Subject of the present Debate. And from hence alone, I think, *Christians* should be very cautious how they give in- to any Notions that are inconsistent with such an *Interpretation*.

IF indeed, the Supposition of our *Sa- viour's* speaking here concerning *his Supper*, be attended with any Absurdity, shocking to Reason, or opposite to what has been plainly reveal'd, then an *Interpretation* at- tended with such Difficulties must be given up, in Honour to the Truth and Certainty of God's Word. But if there are no such Difficulties in the Way, and especially if the *Interpretation* be moreover just and na- tural, perfectly agreeable to the *Context*, and to the Character and *Office* of our Lord, as the Instructor of Mankind, then, what was before *probable*, will appear evidently and necessarily true; and they who obstinately reject an *Interpretation* so supported, should well consider, whether they have not some- thing more than *Rashness* to answer for, by so doing. It is time therefore to make a particular Inquiry into this Matter.

THE Point in Question is this. Whether our *Saviour* speaks in this *Discourse* concerning *Faith* in Him, and concerning the *Doctrines* of *Christianity* under the Terms of *Flesh* and *Bloud*, and *Meat* and *Drink*, to nourish his *Disciples* to *eternal Life*. Or whether He meant to acquaint them by these Expressions, that they should afterwards partake of a *Religious Ordinance*, whereby they should eat his *Body*, and drink his *Bloud Sacramentally*, and from thence be nourish'd to *Eternal Life*.

HERE is no doubt made by any Body, but that *one* of these *two* Things must be meant throughout this whole *Discourse*; so that every Argument that concludes against its being to be understood in the *former* Sense, is so far of force for our understanding it in the *latter*. I proceed therefore to shew,

III. THIRDLY, that our *Blessed Saviour* has himself made a *Distinction* in the Beginning of this *Discourse*, (which He has also preserv'd thro' the whole) between *Faith* in Him, and in his *Doctrines*, and that

*Meat*



*Meat* which He promises to give, and which He afterwards so often calls his *Flesh* and *Bloud*, and consequently that something different from *Faith* in Him, and in his *Doctrines*, must be meant by *Flesh* and *Bloud*, otherwise He will be suppos'd to have made a Distinction between Things that do not differ.

FOR, at the very entrance upon this *Discourse*, He says to his Followers — *Labour not for the Meat that perisheth, but for the Meat that endureth unto Life Eternal* — \* He took occasion to give them this Advice from observing the Pains they had taken in following Him over the Sea of *Tiberias*, in hopes of being again fed by Him to the full. The Pains they had taken for this sensual and temporary End, He calls their *Labour*, and presently advises them to use the like *Labour* and Diligence for a much more noble and advantageous Purpose, even for the obtaining *Food* that would *endure for ever*. As certainly therefore as there is a Distinction here made, between that bodily Work or *Labour* which the *Jews*

\* V. 27.

used for the procuring *bodily Food*, and the *Food* it self they *labour'd* for, so certain is it, that the *Labour* which our *Saviour* exhorts them to use, for the obtaining the *Food that endureth unto Life eternal*, must be distinguish'd from that *Food*, for which this *Labour* was to be employ'd. And so the *Jews* understood the Matter; for they immediately ask Him — *What shall we do that we might work the Works of God?*\*

THEY say nothing of the *Meat*; they inquire only concerning those *Works of God* that were necessary for procuring it. And they hereby plainly shew, they understood Him as speaking of some great *Blessing*, under the Expression of *Meat that endureth to Everlasting Life*; and that the Means of obtaining it, were the *Works of God*, or *Works* pleasing and acceptable to Him, in the Nature of which they desire to be particularly inform'd.

To this Question our Lord directly answers and says — *This is the Work of God, that ye believe in Him, whom He hath sent*†.

\* V. 28.

† V. 29.

By which 'tis evident, that *Faith in Christ* is the *Work of God* concerning which they were inquiring, and which was before declar'd to be the Means, whereby they were to obtain that *Food*, which *endureth unto eternal Life*. Our Saviour therefore Himself makes a plain Distinction between *Faith* in Him, and that *Meat* or *Food* which He afterwards calls his *Flesh*, and which is the chief Subject of this whole *Discourse*; and consequently whatever is meant by *Meat* here, and afterwards so often mention'd, it cannot be *Faith in Christ*, from which He had so expressly distinguish'd it, as even to make *one* the *Cause* and the Means of obtaining the *other*.

AND this Distinction is plainly preserv'd thro' the whole. And accordingly after our Saviour had told them, that He was the *Bread of God, that cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life to the World*\*; and after they had thereupon desir'd Him, *evermore to give them this Bread*†, — He saith unto them — *I am the Bread of Life; He that cometh to me, shall never hunger,*

\* V. 33.

† V. 34.

and

and He that believeth in me, shall never thirst.

IN which Words the Bread of Life is promised to Him that *cometh* to Christ, and *believeth* in Him, as the Food whereby his Hunger and Thirst should be fully satisfy'd. So that again, as before, the *coming* to Christ, or *believing* in Him, is mention'd as a Thing of another Kind from the Bread here spoken of, and indeed as the Cause and the Means of obtaining that Bread.

THE same may be observ'd in what our Saviour says in the 47th, and three following Verses. But the Point is already sufficiently prov'd, wherefore I proceed and observe

IV. FOURTHLY, that if by *eating* the *Flesh*, and *drinking* the *Bloud* of Christ, we are to understand *Faith* in Christ and receiving his *Doctrines*, without any View to the *eating* his *Flesh*, and *drinking* his *Bloud* in the Lord's Supper; then these *Phrases* must signify the *believing* in Him, and receiving his *Doctrines*, throughout this whole Passage.

*Passage.* For there is not the least Ground for making any Difference between the Meaning of these *Phrases*, as they are found in different Parts of this *Passage*. And yet at the 51st *Verse*, where our *Saviour* says, — *The Bread that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the Life of the World,* either his *Real*, or his *Sacramental Flesh* and *Bloud* must be meant; because it cannot be said either with Propriety, or Truth, that He gave, or offer'd his *Doctrines*, for the *Life of the World*.

AND if *Origen*, and some other fanciful Men have indulg'd themselves in a Liberty of allegorizing away the plain and natural Meaning of these Expressions; I think little Regard is to be had to their Authority, in the Use of such a licentious Way of explaining *Scripture*, as will evacuate and destroy all Certainty of *Interpretation* whatsoever.

V. FIFTHLY, it is very arbitrary in any one to insist upon the taking all these *Phrases* so entirely in a Figurative Sense, as to signify only a *Belief* in Christ and his Do-

H

ctrines



ctrines, or in Conjunction with them, a *Practice* also agreeable thereunto (which is the learned and excellent Dr. *Clager's* Notion) unless there could be some Example produc'd, either from the sacred or prophane Writers, whereby it might appear, that any *Teacher* of Religion or Philosophy, has ever recommended any Point either of Belief or Practice, under the Notion of *eating his own Flesh*, or drinking *his own Bloud*.

ALL that is produced by Dr. *Whitby*, to shew, that *Meat* and *Drink*, *Bread* and *Wine*, are by *sacred* Authors, as well as *Rabbinical*, sometimes used to signify *Maxims* of Religion or Philosophy; and that the Terms of *eating* and *drinking* are apply'd to them in the Sense of embracing and digesting them, is quite foreign to the Purpose, unless it could be likewise shewn that the same Authors did call the Doctrines they taught, their *own Flesh* and *Bloud*, and requir'd their *Disciples* to embrace them under the *Phrase* of *eating* and *drinking* the same. For it is one Thing to call Doctrines or Precepts by the Name of *Food* or *Flesh* in general; and  
another

another to call them the *Flesh* and *Bloud* of any particular Person. Dr. *Whitby's* Instances therefore do by no means justify the suppos'd *catachrestical* Use of these *Phrases* in the *Discourse* before us; because the Manner in which other *Instructors* have made use of these Terms, is neither the same with, nor similar to, that in which our Saviour has used them.

IF indeed there was nothing in the *Christian* Dispensation, to which these Expressions could with Ease and Propriety be apply'd, the Singularity of the *Interpretation* ought to be no Bar against receiving it, in order to avoid an inconvenient Construction. But in the Case under Consideration, a strong *Catachresis* is chosen, when a common and easy *Figure* is much more agreeable to the known State of Things under the *Gospel*. And repeated *Expressions* are understood in a forc'd, unusual, and uncouth Way, at the same Time that they are suitably and naturally applicable to that very *Institution*, which is peculiar to *Christianity*, and to which if they had not that very Relation which is contended for, it is not

H 2

easily

easily conceivable, that they would ever have been used at all, much less have been so often, and with so much Zeal and Earnestness repeated. For

VI. SIXTHLY, if these Expressions are all to be understood as denoting our Saviour's *Doctrine* only, and *Faith* in Him, a difficulty arises how to account for his Conduct in this Manner of conveying his Instructions.

'Tis plain his Auditors took great Offense at his *Discourse*, upon the Account of these very Expressions, as importing something harsh and difficult to be conceiv'd. When our Lord saw their Prejudices would immediately have been remov'd, if He had acquainted them with the Matter as you understand it, and had told them they quite mistook the Point, in taking what He said, in the Sense of any sensible and *real eating* and *drinking*; yet He condescends to no such Means of Instruction, but persists still in the use of the same Expressions, with additional Earnestness, and a warmth unusual.

I HAVE

I HAVE never yet met with any one who could give a clear Account of the Reason of our Blessed Lord's Behaviour in this Case, upon the Supposition of his not meaning any Thing of that, which had given Occasion for so much Mistake in his Hearers.

FOR it seems very strange, that He should persist so long in teaching his Hearers by the use of such Expressions, which He saw serv'd to no Purpose of present Instruction, if the Point He was teaching in this very *dark and Figurative Way*, was no other than what He had before taught in so plain and direct Terms — *Joh. 3. 36. that — He who believeth on the Son, hath everlasting Life.* For this is to suppose, that He used all this Earnestness, only to justify an *obscure Manner* of enforcing a *plain Truth*.

I CANNOT but think, that in Honour to our *Saviour*, nothing should induce his *serious Disciples* to imagin, that He could have pursued this Method of inculcating the Necessity of believing in Him, if there was no other Reason for his doing it, than  
what

what has ever yet been suggested. And this is another strong Reason against your *Interpretation* of this Passage.

VII. SEVENTHLY, the *Identity* of the Meaning of the Words used in this *Discourse* of our Saviour, with that of those used by Him in the *Institution*, should naturally lead us to think He speaks of the same Thing.

‘TIS true indeed, what He calls his *Flesh* in this *Discourse*, He calls his *Body* in the Words of the *Institution*. But forasmuch as his *Flesh* is here spoken of in Contradistinction to his *Bloud*, and his *Bloud* is spoken of as separated from his *Flesh*, the Meaning is exactly the same, as if what He calls his *Flesh*, He had call’d his *Body*.

AND, I believe, there never was a Man, who, in any other Case, would pretend, that the *Flesh* and *Bloud* of a Man, spoken of as separated one from the other, could have any different Meaning, from the *Body* and *Bloud* of that Man. And therefore as some of the very first Christian Fathers, *Ignatius\**,



*natus*\*, *Justin*†, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*‡ do call the Bread in the *Eucharist* the *Flesh* of Christ, and our own Church has done the same ||, and they have by all Ecclesiastical Writers been used promiscuously; so I think nothing but a resolv'd Purpose of serving an *Hypothesis*, could ever dispose any Man to go about to shew any real Difference between the Sense of the Words used here, and in the *Institution*.

BUT if this is the Case, by what Rules of Reason, or *Criticism* can it be suppos'd, that the Words do not denote the *Sacramental Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, as well in one Place, as the other?

\* Εὐχαριστίας καὶ πνευματικῆς ἀπέχοντα (sc. Hæretici) διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ΣΑΡΚΑ εἶναι τῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. *Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn. cap. VII.*

† Οὐ γὰρ ὡς κρινὸν ἄρτον, οὐδὲ κρινὸν πόμα πῦντι λαμβάνομεν, ἀλλὰ — τὴν δι' εὐχῆς — εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν — ἐκείνου τῷ σαρκοποιηθέντι Ἰησοῦ καὶ ΣΑΡΚΑ καὶ αἷμα ἰδιόαχθηται εἶναι. *Justin. Mart. Apolog. I. p. 96. Ed. Thirlb.*

‡ Ο ὢν ἄρτος ὁ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς δοθείς, ὁ ἦός ἐστι, τοῖς ἐδιδαν βυλομέναις. Ο δὲ ἄρτος δι' ἐγὼ δάσω, φησὶν, ἡ ΣΑΡΞ μου ἐστίν· ἥτοι ᾧ τριφεται ἡ σὰρξ διὰ τῆς ΕΥΧΑΡΙΣΤΙΑΣ.

*Clem. Alex. Excerpt. Theodot. c. XIII.*

|| Commun. Office. Prayer before Consecration.

VIII.

VIII. EIGHTHLY, if this *Passage* does not relate to the *Eucharist*, it is not accountable for what Reason our Saviour does so often distinguish between the Actions of *eating* and *drinking*; but especially that He should so *generally* make mention of his *Bloud*, as well as his *Flesh*, and in contradistinction to his *Flesh*, and require the *drinking one*, as well as *eating the other*, in order to obtain the *Benefits* here promis'd to those *Actions*. 'Tis certain, there is no *Emphasis* in this distinction, no particular *Weight* for such a conjunctive mention of these Actions, if *Faith* and *Obedience* are alone meant. The *drinking* his *Bloud* has in this Way of understanding it, the self same Meaning with *eating* his *Flesh*, which destroys the very Reason of the distinction, and lessens the Accuracy and Justness of the Manner of speaking so carefully, and with Repetition observ'd.

BUT if the partaking of the *Lord's Supper* is here directed, as there was a Necessity for such a distinction between these Actions of *eating* his *Flesh*, and *drinking* his  
*Bloud*

*Bloud*; so is there a plain Reason for their being so generally remember'd.

To this I shall add no more, but that I think, it must be allow'd by all, that, upon the Supposition of its being the Design of our *Saviour* to set forth the Necessity of performing a Duty afterwards to be instituted in *Remembrance* of his *Body* and *Bloud*, and to make his *Disciples* the more capable of understanding the true and full Design of it, when it should come to be instituted, and to describe the Benefits that his *Church* was in all Ages to expect from a due Celebration of it, no Expressions, no manner of Speech whatsoever can be devised, that could more plainly and distinctly do this, than what our *Blessed Saviour* has been pleas'd to make use of in this *Discourse*.

FROM all these Considerations I think I may venture to affirm, that your rejecting this *Passage* as having no Relation to the Point in hand, without one good Reason suggested by your self, and without so much as examining any Thing that has ever  
I been

been offer'd by others in support of a different *Interpretation*, is a Conduct, to which your *Readers* may justly remonstrate, as *very partial*, and directly contrary to the *Profession* with which you set out\*.

THAT I may avoid the like Imputation, I shall not conceal from the *Reader*, whatever has been, or, as far as I know, can be objected, with any shew of Reason, to the understanding this *Passage* in the Sense above given. And

I. FIRST, it may be objected, that, if the *eating* and *drinking* Christ's *Flesh* and *Bloud* so often here mention'd, be to be understood of eating his *Body* and *Bloud* in the *Sacrament*, it will be an Acknowledgment of the Truth of the *Popish* Doctrine, of the Change of the *Bread* and *Wine* into the natural *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ; and that they who plead for such an *Interpretation*, are introducing the absurd Notion of *Transubstantiation*, under the Guise of explaining the true Doctrine of the *Lord's Supper*.

\* Pag. 2.

Now,

Now, for my own Part, I readily acknowledge, that if this Objection had any Foundation in *Truth*, I should think it sufficient of it self, to destroy all that has been alledg'd in favour of their Opinion, who understand this *Passage* to relate to the *Lord's Supper*, and every Thing else that can be brought in Support and Defence of it. Because I am persuaded, no Argument for any particular *Interpretation* of *Scripture* whatsoever can be more evident, than it is, that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is false. It being indeed as certainly *false*, as we can be sure that any Thing else is true. It is incumbent therefore upon me, to clear this *Interpretation* from this Charge, or else to give it up for ever.

THE Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is known to be this — That the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine*, after the Words of *Consecration* are pronounced, are converted into the true, real, natural *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*.

Now this can never be prov'd from this *Passage*, even if the Words of it, were,



from the Beginning to the End, to be all interpreted in the grossest and most *literal* Manner.

1. FOR then, first, (as has been often observ'd against the *Romanists*) the *Change* must be just the contrary Way, to what they suppose and avow. And instead of a *Change* of *Bread* and *Wine* into the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, here must be a *Change* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* into *Bread* and *Wine*. For after our Saviour had said, that *they must eat his Flesh and drink his Bloud* — He gives the Reason for their doing this in these Words — *For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Bloud is Drink indeed.* So that if these Words are to be understood *literally* and a *Conversion* of one Substance into another is suppos'd to be asserted, 'tis evidently just contrary to what the *Romanists* have decided, concerning the *Transubstantiation* they pretend to believe; and it is not *Bread* that becomes his *Body* or *Flesh*, and *Wine* that becomes his *Bloud*; but his *Flesh* or *Body* is turn'd into *Meat* or *Bread*, and his *Bloud* into *Drink* or *Wine*.

2. AND

2. AND again Secondly, since his *Flesh* is here said to be *Meat* or *Bread indeed*, and his *Bloud* to be *Drink* or *Wine indeed* — if the *literal* Meaning is strictly the true one, then, they who *eat* and *drink* his *Flesh* and *Bloud* in the *Sacrament*, do therewith *eat* and *drink* true and real *Bread* and *Wine*, again contrary to the plain Decision of the *Romanists* in this Case, which is, that after this *Change*, there is neither *Bread* nor *Wine* remaining.

AND indeed the understanding this *Passage* as directing the *Duty*, and explaining the Use and Advantage of the *Lord's Supper*, is so far from giving Countenance to any Doctrines of *Rome*, that not only *Transubstantiation*, but the Practice of depriving the *Laity* of the half Part of this *Sacrament*, by denying them the Cup, is also evidently condemn'd hereby.

FOR the *Benefits* here promis'd, are declar'd to be the Effects of these Actions of eating and drinking taken together. As *eating* the *Flesh* of *Christ*, and *drinking* his *Bloud* are both alike requir'd ; so the *beneficial*

cial Effects are represented as flowing from both in *Conjunction*.

V. 53. *Then said Jesus unto them ———*  
*Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man,*  
 AND DRINK HIS BLOOD, *ye have no Life*  
*in you.*

54. *Whoſo eateth my Fleſh, AND DRINK-*  
 ETH MY BLOOD, *hath Eternal Life.*

56. *He that eateth my Fleſh, AND DRINK-*  
 ETH MY BLOOD, *dwelleth in me, and I in*  
*Him.*

IF this *Paſſage* therefore does relate to the *Lord's Supper*, whether theſe Expreſſions are taken to ſignify *Chriſt's Real*, or his *Sacramental Body and Blood*, 'tis moſt evident, the ſpiritual Advantages here recounted, being made the Effects of partaking of *both*, by ſuch Actions as are reſpectively proper to each of them, that is, by *eating* what is here call'd his *Fleſh*, and by *drinking* what is here call'd his *Blood*, the *Romaniſts* by denying the *Laity the Cup* in the *Lord's Supper*, do plainly adminiſter it in an imperfect and inſufficient Manner; and do thereby

rob

rob their People of their undoubted Right, and in a Point of the greatest Importance.

BUT after all we are secur'd against any use that can be made in favour of *Transubstantiation*, tho' this *Passage* should be allow'd to relate to the *Lord's Supper*, by the *Key* that our *Blessed Saviour* has Himself given us for the *opening* and explaining of it.

FOR when his Followers were offended at his *Doctrine*, as if He had really taught them, that they were to *eat* and *drink* his *natural Body* and *Bloud*. v. 60.

61. He said unto them, doth this offend you?

62. What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend where He was before?

63. It is the Spirit that quickeneth; the Flesh profiteth nothing; the Words that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.

THE Meaning of which Words may be thus represented, very agreeably to the occasion of their being spoken, and to the plain Import of them.

You

You take Offense without Cause, by thus supposing me to mean, what never could have enter'd into the Minds of any, but Persons of the grossest Conceptions. Do you not observe, I am speaking of giving not only to you, but all others who shall *believe* in me, *this Food* which is to *nourish* you and *them to Everlasting Life*? But is my *natural Body* sufficient for this? Can that be present to all such Persons at once? Or, can you imagine that I am always to be *corporally* present with you? I must *ascend* to my Father, and what will you think of this Matter then? When the *Body* you so weakly imagin I am proposing to you for *continual Food*, shall be remov'd far out of your Sight and Presence? But indeed, *it is the Spirit that quickeneth; the Flesh profiteth nothing*. If what you so absurdly conceive, was actually to be done, and you were indeed to *feed* upon my *Flesh*, this could not of it self profit you, as to any spiritual Effect. This could have *naturally* no Power to *nourish* you to *everlasting Life*. This Nourishment must be the Effect of God's Holy Spirit, giving Virtue and Energy to what you shall *eat* and *drink* as my *Body* and



and *Bloud*. *The Words* therefore *that I speak unto you, they are Spirit, and they are Life.* — They are to be understood in a *Spiritual* Sense; you are to *eat my Flesh*, and *drink my Bloud* in such a Way, as the Souls of Men can with Truth be said to perform these Actions, and be nourish'd thereby, which can be only in a *Spiritual Manner*\*.

Now this easy and natural Explication of these Words effectually clears the whole *Passage* from all Possibility of helping the *Popish Cause*, altho' the Expressions of *eating Christ's Flesh* and *drinking his Bloud*, should be interpreted concerning the *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine* in the *Lord's Supper*.

FOR since by our Saviour's own *Interpretation*, we are guarded against all gross Conceptions, and are admonish'd to understand that his *Flesh* and *Bloud* are *Meat* and *Drink* to *Christians* in a *Spiritual* Sense only; it makes no Alteration in the Case at all, whether our Saviour be here supposed to affirm, that this *Food* for the Nourishment

\* See Archbishop *Sharpe's* Sermons Vol. 7. Sermon. 15.

of our Souls is convey'd to us by *Faith* and good Works only, or in conjunction with them, by actually *eating* and *drinking* something as a visible Representation of his *Body* and *Bloud*, for the Conveyance of this *Spiritual Meat* and *Drink*. *Transubstantiation* is alike excluded both Ways, and the Charge of it is equally absurd and injurious whether made upon those who hold *one* Interpretation or the *other*.

BUT I am so jealous of affirming any *Interpretation* of *Scripture* to be certainly the *true* one, concerning which Persons of Distinction for Learning, Judgment and Piety have gone into different *Opinions*, that I shall not be forward in insisting upon what bids so fair for Reception, if I cannot clearly answer every *Exception* that can be made to it. I proceed therefore to another, and that is

II. SECONDLY, that if our Saviour speaks here of *Sacramental eating* his *Flesh* and *drinking* his *Bloud*, then He having expressly promised *Eternal Life* to those who *eat* his *Flesh* and *drink* his *Bloud*, they will  
be

be all intituled to *this Reward* upon every Participation of this *Holy Ordinance*.

BUT now all that is formidable in this Objection is founded upon a false Supposition. It certainly has the Appearance of something strange, to affirm that Eternal Life is the Reward of *eating Christ's Body* and *drinking his Bloud* in his *Supper*; but why has it this Appearance? only because it should seem as if it was affirm'd, that the *one* is *necessarily* consequent upon the *other*. But is this affirm'd by any one who speaks in the highest Terms of the *Importance* and the Benefits of this *Holy Ordinance*? Is it not *universally* affirm'd by those who hold one, as well as the other Side of this Question, that the *unworthy* Performance of this Duty does only heighten Mens Guilt, instead of intituling them to *Eternal Life*, or any other *Blessings*.

THEY who think this *Passage* to have a Relation to the *Lord's Supper*, do not only believe a *present* Attention needful for a *beneficial* Discharge of this *Duty*, but a diligent *Examination* of the Heart, and a due

*Preparation* of Life, join'd with a true and lively *Faith*; and when these *Dispositions* and good Works are first requir'd, is there any Absurdity in supposing it to be the Doctrine of this *Passage*, that they must be all made effectual for a Reconciliation with God, and for the securing a *Title* to *Eternal Life*, by *eating* the *Flesh* of *Christ* and *drinking* his *Bloud*, in the Way He has appointed? Do not all those who hold the other *Interpretation* apply, without Scruple, all the Promises of this *Passage* to Faith and good Works? And if a Compliance with this Duty be suppos'd to be *one* of those good Works, and such a one too as gives a Value to all the rest, by procuring us a Title to the Blessings purchased for us by the *Sacrifice* of the *Cross*, is there any Thing *unreasonable*, or is there any Thing *inconvenient* in the Supposition?

BAPTISM is allow'd by all to be an *Ordinance* whereby *Christians* are admitted into *Covenant* with God thro' *Christ*, whereby their past Sins are pardon'd, *Grace* and *Power* is given them to please God by a Life of future Obedience; and a Title to *Eternal Life*

*Life* is ensur'd to them upon their Perform-  
ance of the Terms requir'd.

AND as *this Sacrament* is thus allow'd to  
be the Means of *Application* and *Conveyance*  
of the greatest possible *Benefits* to Man, what  
Grounds are there for objecting to the o-  
ther Sacrament's being a like Means for the  
conveying the same Benefits?

FAITH and Repentance are the neces-  
sary Conditions of a profitable receiving  
of either *Sacrament*; and where they are  
present, a Covenant-Right to Eternal Life  
may with the self same Reason be suppos'd  
to be alike annex'd to both. But this gives  
occasion to mention another Objection to  
the understanding this Discourse concerning  
the *Lord's Supper*, and that is

III. THIRDLY, that our *Blessed Saviour*  
must then be supposed to make the *eating*  
his *Flesh*, and *drinking* his *Bloud* an absolute  
Condition of Eternal Life, so as not only  
to be GENERALLY, but UNIVERSALLY and  
INDISPENSABLY necessary to *Salvation*.

It



It is not to be deny'd that there were many among the *Ancients*, who thought thus of the Necessity of actually partaking of this *Holy Ordinance* in order to Salvation; and that they chiefly grounded their *No-tions* herein upon some Expressions in this *Passage*. And that a pretty general Practice prevail'd early in the Church, of giving the *Holy Eucharist* to *Infants*, as necessary for their Salvation, supported by, and mainly grounded upon this *Discourse*, is also certain. But whether this be a just Consequence from the *Supposition* of our Saviour's being speaking here of his *Supper*, is a Matter of a quite different Consideration, and does not affect the present Point in Question, which Way soever it be determin'd.

FOR, if it be a true Consequence, then indeed it may be justly urged in reproach to those Churches, which do not retain a Doctrine and Practice so well grounded; but it can afford no Argument against the understanding this *Discourse* as enjoining the *Duty* and setting forth the *Benefits* of partaking of the *Lord's Supper*. But there is really no manner of occasion to understand  
our

our Saviour's Expressions here with that great Strictness, as if they extended to every Member of his Church, as well *Infants*, as *Idiots* and *Lunaticks*, and Persons incapable, thro' any natural Defect, of that Attention to the Design of the *Duty*, and that Preparation of Heart and Manners in which the right and worthy Performance of it doth consist.

'TIS true, our Saviour says here, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Bloud, ye have no Life in you* \*. But whom says He this to? To those who were *Adults*, to those who were of *ripe* and *sound* Understanding to know, and who had it in their Power to do, what was enjoin'd them.

AND common Sense teaches every one to understand all *general* Directions for the Performance of any Duty, in such a Manner, that what is commanded may be naturally possible, and within the Compass of their Power to whom they are given. There seems therefore no kind of Reason

\* V. 53.

to ground a Necessity of giving this *Holy Sacrament* to *Infants* or *Idiots* or any other Persons incapable of mentally *eating Christ's Body* and *drinking his Bloud*, upon any Expressions in this *Passage*, any more than upon the Words of the *Institution* it self. Because the *eating Christ's Flesh*, and *drinking his Bloud*, at the same time that it is requir'd as a *Duty*, is also propos'd as a Reward of that *Labour* (or *doing the Work of God*, which our Saviour explains by *believing*) which Children and Persons of unsound Minds are not capable of performing.

AND accordingly, altho' it was the *universal* Opinion of the *Ancients*, that a Participation of the *Lord's Supper* was necessary in order to Salvation in all *capable* Subjects, and those who could be justly chargeable with Blame for the Neglect and Contempt of so *plain* and *important* a *Duty*, and they justly grounded their Opinion upon this *Passage*; yet they did not *all* infer from hence, that the Eucharist was to be given to Children. And accordingly the Practice of admitting *Infants* to the *Lord's Supper* cannot be prov'd to have been in use from  
the

the Beginning; nor was it at any Time afterwards *universally* observ'd by the Church, as will be evident to any one, who will carefully examine what a *late Author* has urged, in order to shew that it was so; who, as He was zealous for the revival of the Practice, so He wanted neither *Art* nor *Learning* to make the best of his Argument\*.

I KNOW of no other Objection worthy of an Answer. And as to those I have mention'd, I think upon the whole, they are very far from giving any fair and impartial Reasoner, just Cause to suspect the Force and Evidence of what has been alledg'd in Favour of the *ancient Interpretation* of this *Passage*.

AND it may not be improper to observe to the Reader, that even among those learned Men, who have chosen to take your Way of explaining this *Passage*, and who do not suppose any Part of it directly to

\* Mr. James Peirce late of Exon, in his *Essay in Favour of the ancient Practice of giving the Eucharist to Children*. Essay p. 68.

*relate* to the *Lord's Supper*, there are few, who do not allow, that many of the Expressions, may be well accommodated to the *Lord's Supper*, and may be interpreted in a *secondary* Sense, of the *Benefits* arising from a due Participation thereof.

THE learned Dr. *Clagett*, who has taken the most Pains upon this Point, and with the just Reputation of having discuss'd it with great Exactness and Ability, is far from being so positive as you are; and tho' He looks upon the whole *Discourse* as principally design'd to direct the Followers of Christ, under *Figurative Expressions*, to work the *Works of God*, by *Faith* in Christ, and *Obedience* to his Will; yet acknowledges, that many of them do really signify those Things which are signified in the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper*, altho' not primarily meant of it; and that they may therefore be very aptly apply'd to it, — “Nay and that there  
“ are some Cases in which a Man may argue from the one to the other; and some  
“ Questions to which both one and the other give equal Light.” \*

\* Preface to Paraphrase upon 6th St. *John* p. 7, 8.



YOU next proceed to some other Observations; and you begin with these Words, "The Essence of this Duty, we see, consists in the Remembrance of Christ." \*

THE *Essence* of a Thing is another Word for the *Nature* of it; and *that* in which the *Essence* of any Thing consists, is what *defines* the Thing, and distinguishes it from all others of a different *Species*. Accordingly in the Case before us — If the Performance of the *Duty of the Lord's Supper* consists in a *Remembrance of Christ*, then this *Duty* may be defin'd to be — A *Remembrance of Christ*. Now the *Logicians* teach, that in all just *Definitions*, the Principles or Parts of the *Definition* do *reciprocate* with the Thing defin'd: Consequently, if it be true, that the Performance of this *Duty* is the *Remembrance of Christ*, then convertibly, — The *Remembrance of Christ* is the Performance of this *Duty*, and whenever *Christ* is remember'd, this *Duty* is perform'd; — and consequently whoever remembers *Christ* in his own Closet, apart from every *Assembly of Christians*, without *Priest*, without *Consecration*,

and even without the Participation of *Bread* and *Wine*, does thereby perform the *whole* of this *Duty*.

YOUR *Mistake* here is occasion'd by your not attending to the *true Nature* of the Thing you *define*; which being of the *complex* Kind, and consisting not in *one* Action but *several*, cannot be rightly *defin'd* without a distinct Enumeration of *all* the Actions whereof it consists. That of *Remembrance* is certainly *one*, and an *essential one*, but still it is but *one*. And to call it the *Essence* of this *Duty*, is just as absurd, as it would be to affirm, that the *Essence* of a *Man* consists in his having a *Body* capable of Sensation, altho' that Property is acknowledged to be no more peculiar to *Man*, than to any other *Animal*. These are some of the very first Principles of *Science*, and it is a Shame you should give Occasion for the mention of such *obvious* Things, to prevent your misleading your *Readers*.

YOU must therefore either confess a great Carelessness and Inaccuracy in this Matter, or affirm that this *Duty* we are speaking

ing of, does consist in one Action only —  
*The Remembrance of Christ.* And yet if you  
do affirm this, then the mental receiving  
the *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, without the  
use of any Thing *external* and *visible*, is suf-  
ficient; which I think would better suit the  
Pen of a *Quaker*, than yours.

BUT altho' this is a manner of Expres-  
sion several Times used by you, yet foras-  
much as you in many Places throughout  
your Treatise\* speak of *eating Bread*, and  
*drinking Wine*, as *essential* to the right par-  
taking of this Holy Ordinance, I will sup-  
pose your calling the *Remembrance of Christ*  
the very *Essence* of this *Duty*, to be no o-  
ther than the Effect of inconsideration, and  
shall therefore make no other use of it,  
than to advertise your *Readers*, not to ascribe  
too much to the Skill and Accuracy of their  
Instructor.

AND that I may fully justify my self for  
giving this Caution, I do farther observe,  
that the *Inaccuracy* last mention'd, is not  
the only one in *this very Case*.

FOR whereas you now call the *Remembrance* of *Christ* the *Essence* of this *Duty*, you elsewhere call it the *END* of it. For in your *Eighth Proposition* you say — *It appears from these PASSAGES that the END for which our Lord instituted this Duty, was the REMEMBRANCE of Himself\**.

WHAT? is the *Essence* of a *Duty*, and the *End* for which that *Duty* was *instituted*, the self same Thing? At this Rate, the *Worship* of God which is the *Duty*, and the *Glory* of God, which is the *End* of that *Worship*, is the same Thing. *Baptism* by Water in the Name of the *Blessed Trinity*, which is the *Duty*, is the same Thing with *Remission of Sins*, the *End* thereof.

SUCH Inaccuracies as these are really reproachful to any one, who sets up for an Instructor; and they serve only to confound the less attentive *Readers*. For the Truth after all is — The *Remembrance* of *Christ* is neither the *End*, nor the *Essence* of this *Duty*, but only an *Essential Part* thereof, which tho' necessary to compleat the same

\* Pag. 23, 24.

yet will not of it self suffice, but must be used in Conjunction with *eating Bread* and *drinking Wine* duly consecrated to the great Purpose of representing the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*.

AFTER you have observ'd, that "Faith  
" in Christ, as sent into the World by  
" God, is the Ground of this Remembrance  
" of Him, and that, " professing our selves  
" to belong to Him, in a Religious Sense,  
" is imply'd in it, and that, " professing  
" our selves to have a Relation to all other  
" Christians, is likewise imply'd in it," \*  
You draw the following *Proposition*.

XVII. *It is an Employment very proper and very agreeable to this Institution, to revive in our Minds upon this Occasion, the force of all those Arguments, upon which we believe in Christ, to own our selves his Disciples, to confess and heartily condemn all our Deviations from his Laws and Precepts; to acknowledge before God our Obligations to live as his Disciples, who expect to be happy upon*

\* Pag. 104.



*his Terms only, to express our sincere Thankfulness for his Doctrine, Example, Life and Death, to profess our Dependance upon Him, as our only Head; and lastly, to revive and enlarge our affectionate Union and Sympathy with all other Members, of the same Body, throughout the World.*

THESE Particulars and many more of equal Importance, are doubtless the *proper Subjects* of every Christian's Thoughts and Meditation, as He has Capacity, and may have Opportunity of laying them before his Mind. And I agree perfectly with you that "a serious Christian cannot better employ his Time, upon this Occasion, than in reviving in his own Mind, the proper Thoughts upon these *Subjects*, in such Manner, as to have the best Effect upon Himself, in the whole Conduct of his Life."\* But I think also, that these and other Particulars, of a like Kind, are not only the *proper Subjects* of Mens Thoughts when they attend upon this Duty, but that they are *absolutely necessary* also, to the right

\* Pag. 105.

*Performance of it*, so far as their Faculties, and the Time allotted for the Purpose, will enable them to employ themselves in this Manner. But this is what you will by no means allow. These *Thoughts* you represent as very *suitable* indeed to the Occasion, and even of the *greatest Importance* to Christians\*, but, as if there might be some Mischief, arising from an Opinion of their being *necessary*, you warn your *Readers* against thinking them so, and affirm, that they are “*not absolutely necessary, to the Performance of this Duty*.” And yet after all, the force of Truth is such, that before you quit the Subject, you do *unwarily* assert the *absolute necessity* of these serious Thoughts, even whilst you are fencing against the Supposition.

FOR at the close of your 107th Page, you say, that “*The Essence of this Duty — consists in our doing it as Christians in Remembrance of Christ and his Love, which CANNOT be done without Faith in Him, and Thankfulness to God.*”

\* Pag. 106.

M

Now

Now from hence 'tis plain, that this *Duty*, according to your own Decision in the Case, cannot be acceptably perform'd without *Faith* in *Christ*, and *Thankfulness* to God. But now, as neither of these can be exerted without *serious Thoughts* and due Attention, without a Consideration of the "*Evidences of Faith*", and without "*re-viving in our Minds* the Memory of the Benefits we have receiv'd, which (as you say your self) "*are the only Grounds of Thanksgiving,*"\* is there not the same necessity for Christians to employ their Thoughts upon these Objects to such a Degree at least as may suffice for the producing *Faith* in *Christ*, and *Thanksgiving* to God, as there is for the *Remembrance* of *Christ* it self, since that *Remembrance*, tho' essential to the Duty, cannot be perform'd without *Faith* in *Christ*, and *Thankfulness* to God?

You seem your self sensible, that you have not herein sufficiently guarded against Exception, and therefore to secure a Retreat, you do in the 107th Page change the

\* Pag. 106.

State of the *Question*, and say, that these  
 “ Employments of our serious Thoughts  
 “ ——— are not so peculiar to the *Lord's*  
 “ *Supper*, as to be *absolutely necessary* to be  
 “ ENLARGED upon, every Time we partake  
 of it.” I say, you have here changed the  
*State* of the *Question*. For surely, there is  
 a wide Difference between saying, that  
 “ These Thoughts are absolutely necessa-  
 “ ry ” ——— and that “ These Thoughts are  
 “ absolutely necessary to be ENLARGED up-  
 “ on.” The former may be true, and the  
 latter intirely false. It may be our *Duty*  
 to employ our most *serious Thoughts* upon  
 these Subjects, for the exciting that *Faith*  
 and *Thankfulness*, which are acknowledged  
 to be necessary for a due Remembrance of  
 Christ; and yet we may be at Liberty to  
 use our own Discretion, whether we will  
*enlarge* upon the same, or not.

YOUR 108<sup>th</sup> Page begins thus, “ Before  
 “ I proceed, I think this the most proper  
 “ Place to apply the whole of what I have  
 “ now laid down concerning the *Nature*  
 “ and *End* of the *Lord's Supper*, more parti-  
 “ cularly to our Publick Office of the Com-

“ munion in order to adapt it to the use  
 “ of such as attend upon this Religious  
 “ Rite in our Churches.” I must own, I  
 have seen frequent occasions of being surpriz’d at many of your Attempts throughout your extraordinary Performance, and never more than when you undertake to reconcile your Notions, with the *Liturgy* or *Decisions* of our Church. But your pretending to do this with the *Communion-Office*, is a Rashness beyond Example; for surely there can be nothing more contrary to the Genius, Sentiments and Design of that whole *Office*, than what you have advanc’d upon this Subject; and the Attempt to reconcile one with the other, is little else than an Affront to common Modesty, in as much as you know, as well as all others, that you hereby fix an *arbitrary* Meaning upon the Words of the *Office*, which they will not bear, and which is also contrary to the known, avow’d, repeated Judgment of the *Compilers*.

You begin this *hardy* undertaking by repeating several Parts of the *Exhortation*, and giving your *Comments* upon them.

UPON



UPON the first Words of the Exhortation — “Ye that Mind to come to the Holy *Communion* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of our Saviour *Christ*” — you make this *Paraphrase* — “You that now remain in the Church with a Design of partaking of that *Bread* and *Wine*, which are appointed to be Memorials of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*.” —

Now you well know, that this is neither a just Representation of the Meaning of these Words, nor of the Church's Design in the use of them. It is agreeable indeed to your *Notion* of the Ineffectiveness of the Signs, *Bread* and *Wine*, for the procuring any Spiritual Benefits to the Receivers, in what Manner soever receiv'd. But when the Words here express'd are not *Bread* and *Wine*, but *Body* and *Bloud* of our Saviour *Christ*, the Things signify'd by those *Symbols*; is it to be born, thus to force your *Notion* upon the *Church* under those very Words which She purposely made choice of to shew She meant more, than the bare Words *Bread* and *Wine* would necessarily have signify'd? It was as easy to have  
said

said — Ye that Mind to come to partake of *Bread* and *Wine* in Remembrance of *Christ's Body* and *Bloud*, as it was to say — “Ye that  
 “ Mind to come to the Holy Communion  
 “ of the Body and Bloud of our Saviour  
 “ Christ.” — And if it had been the Design of the Church to have express'd the same *Notion* of this *Ordinance*, that you maintain, She could and would have done it as clearly as you have done it for her. And shall you then, or any one else, be at Liberty thus to explain away her Meaning, in Defiance of all her Care to secure and ascertain it?

IF there could have been any Doubt concerning the Meaning of these Words from any Ambiguity in the Words themselves, She has taken Care to make it impossible to mistake the Sense in which She uses them, having in her *Catechism* expressly defined the same. For She therein affirms that faithful Communicants, do not only receive *Bread* and *Wine*, as the *Signs* and *Memorials* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*; but moreover *do verily and indeed receive the Body and Bloud of Christ*, in some such Manner

Manner, that their *Souls are strengthen'd and refresh'd* thereby, as their *Bodies are by the Bread and Wine*. In so plain a Case, I do not see how you can avoid the *Charge* of wilfully misrepresenting the Meaning of the *Church*, the better to *adapt* her *Service* to your *Scheme*.

YOU go on in the same *licentious Way*, throughout the whole *Communion-Service*, and are guilty of the same *Violence* upon almost every *Passage* you undertake to explain. But as it would be tiresome to the *Reader*, to be carried thro' so many harsh and unnatural *Glosses*; and as your *Design* in making them is manifestly absurd and indefensible; I shall consult my own and my *Reader's* ease so far, as to mention but one *Instance* more of your *Art* in the *Management* of this extraordinary *Experiment*, and that is what follows.

OUT of the *Prayer* that immediately precedes the *Prayer of Consecration*, you quote the following Words\*. *Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the Flesh*

\* Pag. 114.

of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his Bloud, that our Sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls washed thro' his most precious Bloud, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us.

THIS, you say, is all express'd in the *Figurative* Manner; but that the Meaning of it in plain Words, is this — “ Grant  
 “ that we — may eat this Bread, and  
 “ drink this Wine, which are now to be  
 “ taken in Remembrance of the Flesh [or  
 “ rather Body] and Bloud of Christ, so  
 “ worthily; — that we may be accept-  
 “ able to Thee in it, and that our Religi-  
 “ ous Attendance upon this *Rite* may prove  
 “ one *Mean* of our answering the great  
 “ End of our Blessed Lord's living and dying  
 “ for our Benefit, the being *purify'd both*  
 “ *in Soul and Body*, and may help to lead  
 “ us to a State of *Holiness*, by which alone  
 “ we can hope to be in Union and Friend-  
 “ ship with *Christ*.”

YOU give this as a just *Paraphrase* of the Petition before cited, under a Pretence of setting before your *Readers* the plain Sense of

of *Figurative* Expressions, when yet you leave them all in a Manner, just as you found them; and instead thereof foist in Sentiments and Notions of your own, with an intent to keep your *Scheme* warm upon the Mind of your Readers, which are all as contrary as can well be imagin'd, both to the plain Meaning of the *Prayer*, and to the Design of the *Church* in the use of it.

THE *Church* here expresses the Performance of this Duty by — *eating the Flesh of Christ and drinking his Bloud*. by the Choice of which Word [*Flesh*] instead of *Body*, it appears probable that She design'd to declare her Opinion, that the *Passage* of the *sixth* of St. *John*, was to be accommodated to the *Lord's Supper*.

You, of your own Head, against the Judgment of the *Church*, and the good Reasons by which it is to be defended, arbitrarily exclude the Word *Flesh* upon a false Suggestion of its *carrying a different Idea from that of the Word Body* \*.

\* Pag. 115. in the Note.



THE Church prays, that the Effect of this Holy Action may be, *that our sinful Bodies may be made clean by his Body, and our Souls washed thro' his most precious Bloud*: you without explaining these *Figurative* Expressions, as you undertook to do, only substitute *one* Figurative Word instead of *two*, just of the same Meaning with *them*, and which being unexplain'd by you, leaves the Matter just as you found it; for I am under a great Mistake, if the Word *purify'd*, when apply'd to the *Soul* and *Body*, carries any *Idea* with it clearer than, or indeed different from, the being *cleans'd* and *washed*.

WELL; is this *Purification* however, of the Soul and Body, pray'd for as an Effect of this *eating and drinking the Body and Bloud of Christ* in his *Supper*? No such Matter; we only pray, you say, "that our *Religious Attendance* upon this *Rite*, as *Christians* sincerely believing the Gospel, may prove "one Means of our being purify'd both in "Body and Soul."\*

AND so, tho' the Church absolutely prays

\* Pag. 115.

for this *Purification of Soul and Body*, thro' the Means of *eating and drinking Christ's Body and Bloud*, as an Effect then to take Place, you represent Her as praying, that this *Duty* may be acceptable to God in common with others, may be, in its due Proportion, *one means* of procuring God's *Favour* without supposing any present immediate Effect, or that the Performance of this *Duty* does conduce thereunto in any other Manner, but as an Act of *Justice* or of *Charity*, or any other *single* Instance of Obedience, may be said to do so. What the Truth of this Matter is, shall be carefully examin'd afterwards; it is enough, to observe here, that how agreeable soever your manner of explaining this *Petition*, is to your own *Scheme* and Notions, it is evidently contrary to the plain Design of the Words themselves, and to the avow'd Doctrine and Sentiments of the Church in numberless other Places; which is therefore a Sort of Exposition not to be fairly justify'd, either by good *Example*, or upon sound *Principles*.

I THINK it therefore needless to canvass any other Instances of your *Art*, where-

by you would accommodate the Service of our Church to your Notions upon the present Subject. For, as to any particular Points of Doctrine relating thereunto, which you would thereby inculcate upon your *Disciples*, they have been already examin'd, or they will fall more naturally under Consideration when they come again in my Way. For you have not spar'd to press your Doctrine upon your *Readers* with all convenient Repetitions; so that if any Thing is pass'd over by me in *one* Place, 'tis a Chance but before the *Conclusion*, there may return an Opportunity of taking Notice of it in *another*. But there is something intermix'd with this *Essay* of yours, which is of another Kind, and deserves a distinct Consideration. This is what I shall now proceed to answer.

YOU tell your Disciples \*, that “if there  
 “ be any Time between the Prayer of *Con-*  
 “ *secration*, and their own receiving the  
 “ Bread and Wine, nothing can be more  
 “ agreeable to the Nature and End of this  
 “ *Rite*, than to employ it in some such  
 “ Thoughts as you there lay before them.

\* Pag. 118.

You

You next instruct them with what Thoughts they are to receive the *Holy Elements*. And in the Pages that follow from the 122<sup>d</sup> to the middle of 125<sup>th</sup>, you furnish them with “ Words, which you say, are proper  
 “ Expressions of such Thoughts as this *Holy*  
 “ *Rite* naturally leads Men to, after they  
 “ have receiv’d the *Bread* and *Wine*, if they  
 “ have Time, whilst other Persons are communicating.”

Now forasmuch as these Instructions are principally exceptionable for the *Defect* of them, rather than for any Thing *express’d*, for the *Omission* of many *Thoughts* not only *important* but necessary, rather than for any *Thoughts* that are particularly mention’d, I may be excus’d the Trouble of reciting *these Instructions*, it being sufficient to lay before the Reader their *Defects*. And these are indeed *notorious* and *flagrant*. For having your self declar’d that “ *the Essence* of  
 “ this Duty — consists in our doing it in  
 “ *Remembrance* of *Christ*, and his Love; and  
 “ that this cannot be done, without *Faith*  
 “ in Him, and *Thankfulness* to God \*, it is

\* Pag. 107.

evidently of the *greatest Importance* for Communicants to employ their Minds during this *Solemnity* upon such Thoughts as are proper to excite and increase what is so necessary for the right Performance of this *Duty*. And yet from the beginning to the end of these Instructions you require your Disciples to excite no other Act of *Faith*, but that of *believing Christ to be sent by God, as our Master and Instructor*, and you direct them to thank Him for no one Act of *his Love and Kindness to Mankind whatsoever*; and you direct them to express their Sense of God's Love to Mankind, for no other Instances of it, in the Redemption of the World by his Son, but his sending Him into the World, "to enliven and to strengthen  
 " our sincere Endeavours, to know and  
 " practice his Commandments by his excellent Doctrine, and by his Holy Example.\* This I affirm to be the Amount of all your Instructions upon this Head†. And this indeed I believe to be the whole of a *Socinian's Creed* upon this Point. But if we will take the *Scriptures* for our Guide, and the *Articles* and *Liturgy* of our Church

\* Pag. 123.

† Pag. 118, 124.



as a just *Comment* upon them, we shall soon see, that this is as far from a true Representation of the Compass and Extent of that *Faith* and *Thanksgiving*, which are requir'd for a worthy Performance of this great *Duty*, as a very small *Part* differs from the *whole*.

FOR if *Faith* in *Christ*, be of the *Essence* of this *Duty*, as you own in the Words above, it is so, because we cannot have a just *Remembrance* of Him, without *believing* Him to be what He is in his own *Nature*, and without having a just Sense of what He has done for the Benefit of *Mankind*; in this view of the Case, there is the same Reason for *remembering* Him, as to the Dignity of his Person, and the Discharge of his Offices of *King* and *Priest*, as there is of his being a *Prophet* and *Teacher*. I have your own Authority therefore for charging you with a defective Representation of this Matter, if it does plainly and evidently appear, that the *Scriptures* have declar'd any Thing concerning the *Nature* and *Offices* of our Lord, besides what they teach us concerning his *Instructions* and his *Example*.

Now

Now there is as clear Evidence of our Saviour's being God and the Almighty *Creator* of all Things, and that there was an infinite *Merit* in his Sufferings, sufficient to appease his *Father's* Wrath against Mankind, and to procure, as by an *equivalent Price* pay'd, the Redemption of the World, and the Terms of the *Covenant*, which was establish'd in his *Bloud*, and that agreeably hereunto, He did, by a true and proper *Sacrifice* of Himself once offer'd, make full *Satisfaction* for the Sins of the whole World; of all these Particulars, I say, there is as full a Declaration in the Holy *Scriptures*, as there is of his being our *Master*, or of his living and dying as an Example of *Innocence* and *Patience*.

AND all the Subtilty of *Socinus* and his Followers, has not been able in the least to shake the Credibility of these Points; but they all stand impregnable in the Opinion of every *Christian*, who has that Veneration for the *Scriptures*, that a sincere Belief of the *Divine Inspiration* of them does of Course demand. For indeed all these Things are so frequently and so strongly asserted

asserted therein, under such a Variety of Phrase and Expression to the same Meaning and Purpose; that if, after all, *Christ* is not *very God*, and his Death was not a true *Sacrifice*, and a real *Attonement*, but a *Seal* only, and *Confirmation* of his Gospel, and for a Pattern of *Patience* and *Resignation* to the Will of God, there is no Manner of Certainty in *Language* at all, and the *Scriptures* themselves can be no *Rule* of *Faith* to any Body.

AND as the *Decisions* of the *Church* and her *Liturgy* are all founded upon the *Truths* of *Scripture*; so we have all the before mention'd Particulars, so expressly asserted by Her, in her *Articles* and *Homilies*, and mix'd and interwoven with her *Prayers* and *Exhortations*, as well in her *Communion-Office*, as in her *Daily Service*, that no *Christian* can sincerely subscribe the Former, and join in the use of the Latter, without acknowledging and professing a *Belief* of them ALL.

WHICH Way then you can be thought to have instructed your *Disciples* in the right Method of discharging this *Duty*, without

O

admo-

admonishing them to attend to these *Particulars*, and to make them the Subject of their sincere Acknowledgments, is what I can by no means comprehend. They are look'd upon by the *Church* to be of so great Importance, as to be all distinctly remember'd and express'd by Her, in one Part or other of her Service upon this solemn Occasion.

SHE exhorts the *Communicants* above all Things to give most humble and hearty Thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the REDEMPTION of the World, by the Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ, both GOD AND MAN, who did humble himself even to the Death of the Cross, FOR US miserable Sinners, who lay in Darknes, and the Shadow of Death, that HE MIGHT MAKE us the Children of God, and exalt us to Everlasting Life\*. And hath taught them to declare Jesus Christ our Lord to be the very Paschal Lamb, which was OFFER'D FOR US, AND HATH TAKEN AWAY THE SIN OF THE WORLD—† And to profess, that our God is one God,

\* Exhortation at the Time of Celebration of the Communion.

† Preface upon Easter Day.

one Lord; not one only Person, but three Persons in one Substance; And that what we believe of the Glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any Difference or Inequality\*; And that Almighty God did give his only Son Jesus Christ to suffer Death upon the Cross FOR OUR REDEMPTION; and that He MADE THERE (BY HIS ONE [OR OWN] OBLATION OF HIMSELF ONCE OFFER'D) A FULL, PERFECT, AND SUFFICIENT SACRIFICE, OBLATION AND SATISFACTION FOR THE SINS OF THE WHOLE WORLD†.

Now if these Things are all true, you ought to have directed your Disciples to be careful in attending to them, and to answer the Design of the *Church* in making them the Subjects of Praise and Thanksgiving to Almighty God, upon this Occasion, as well as what you do mention: If you think they are not true, why did you not warn your Disciples against entertaining any such groundless Notions, which if false, must be all to the Dishonour of God the *Father*,

\* Preface upon the Feast of *Trinity*.

† The Prayer of Consecration.



and can only tend to the transferring from Him, and paying to a *Man*, that Honour and Worship which is alone due to *God*? and how have you then discharg'd your Duty in this Work, which you profess to have undertaken for the Help and Improvement of serious *Christians*?

AT the close of this your Attempt to accommodate the Service of our Church to your *Scheme*, you have these Words; “ I  
“ have thus endeavour'd to explain every  
“ *Passage* in the Communion-Office, which  
“ seem'd at all to want Explication, in or-  
“ der to make the whole more useful to  
“ those who attend in our Churches, up-  
“ on the *Lord's Supper*, with a sincere De-  
“ sire of partaking of it, according to the  
“ Institution of Christ Himself; and of  
“ forming all their *Thoughts* and Behaviour  
“ during the whole Time of their Attend-  
“ ance, agreeably to the true Original De-  
“ sign of it.” \* Now since the *Passages* in  
the Communion-Office, concerning the  
*Divinity* of our *Lord*, and the *Merit* of his  
*Bloud*, and the *Satisfaction* made for the Sins

\* Pag. 132.

of the World, by the *Sacrifice* of Himself upon the *Cross*, are all pass'd over by you without Explication, they are plainly left to be used by all *Communicants*, in their common and obvious Sense and Meaning for the Purpose of *partaking of the Lord's Supper, according to the Institution of Christ Himself, and of forming all their Thoughts and Behaviour, during the whole Time of their Attendance, agreeably to the true Original Design of it.*

So that whatever your private Opinion concerning these Points of *Doctrine* may happen to be, your Conduct in this Matter cannot be justify'd. For if these *Articles* are a Part of your *Creed*, how can you be excused for not laying them before your Disciples, to be duly meditated upon by them, as above all Things conducive to the raising their Devotion, and quickening their Love and Thankfulness to *God and Christ*? If you do not believe them to be true, how can you answer it to your own *Conscience*, to leave your *Disciples* in so much Danger of being led by these Expressions in the Communion Office, (for want of your Ex-  
plication

*plication* of them) into a Performance of this Duty, in a Manner which you believe to be inconsistent with the Truth and *Reality* of Things? Your profess'd concern for the Spiritual Welfare of those you undertake to instruct, should have disposed you to a more open Declaration of what you think to be true. And it is by no means enough not to have mention'd *these Particulars*, as grounds of *Thanksgiving*; you ought moreover to have warn'd your Disciples against thinking them such; they are all suppos'd by you to be Members of our *Church*, and to partake of the *Lord's Supper*, in the use of that publick *Office*, wherein these *Articles* are all, as we have seen, very *emphatically* express'd. Whatever occasion therefore there was for your explaining away the Meaning of the *Church*, in so many *other* Instances, there was certainly at least the same for your doing it in *these*; that you might prevent those Mistakes in the Manner of performing this *Remembrance* of *Christ*, of which you must (according to your *now suppos'd* Principles) judge all Persons guilty, who do it under a Conviction, of the Truth of the *unexplain'd Passages* before mention'd,

( III )

mention'd, which so frequently occur in this excellent *Office* of our *Church*.

IN your 121<sup>st</sup> *Page*, after you had in the preceding *Page*, given your *Disciples* a Caution to *attend* to the Words used by the *officiating Minister*, at the Time of his Delivery of the Holy *Elements* to them, with an *undisturb'd and sincere Application of Mind*, you say, "This is that personal *Appropriation* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, to the "serious and Religious *Remembrance* of the "Body and *Bloud* of *Christ*, which ALONE "can make this *Rite* of any Benefit to a "Believer, by making it acceptable to God. "It is, if I may use the Word, a Sort of "Consecration of them, which is the Duty "of every *Communicant* Himself; and without which, all other *Consecrations*, that "have gone before, will do Him no Service at all. It is HE ALONE, who must, "by his own inward Thought, and Application of his Mind to the *Remembrance* of "Christ, make *this Bread*, and *this Wine*, "different to Himself, from *Bread* and "Wine taken at a Common Meal."

I THINK

I THINK these Words are very offensive and exceptionable upon several Accounts. For

I. FIRST, altho' it is undoubtedly true, that this *Appropriation*, as you call it, of the *Bread* and *Wine* to the Religious *Remembrance* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* by the Mind of the *Communicant*, is necessary on his Part, being indeed only another Expression for performing this *Duty* in *Remembrance* of *Christ*, and so is just as necessary, as that *Remembrance* is, from which it differs only in *Sound*; yet, when you call it a Sort of *Consecration*, you plainly abuse the *Term*, with a Design to lessen the Virtue and Necessity of that *Action*, which is rightly, anciently, and universally, distinguish'd by *that* Word. The *Word* is fix'd and establish'd, in the Sense of a *Separation* of Men or Things, from a *common* to a sacred Use or Office. And when apply'd to this *Holy Ordinance*, has been always understood in the Sense, of *appointing* *Bread* and *Wine* to the most important Purpose, of representing the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ*, by a proper *Form* of Words pronounc'd by a *Person* duly commissioned thereto:



thereto. And there seems the very same necessity for this *Consecration*, that there does for a faithful *Remembrance of Christ* in the Participation of the *Bread* and *Wine*, after they are thus consecrated to their *Holy Use*. For the *Remembrance of Christ* hereby, is a Duty and Benefit to *Christians*, only by virtue of the *Institution*; for which Reason, it cannot answer the *End* design'd, but under those Circumstances and Conditions, which were requir'd by the great *Institutor* himself. Because, upon the Absence of any one of them, the *Action* which consists of several Parts, is *defective* in *that* Particular, and consequently is not *intituled* to those *Benefits*, whatsoever they are, that are by the *Institution* annex'd to the *whole Action*. Now this *Action*, which is rightly call'd *the Celebration of the Lord's Supper*, being at first perform'd by our *Lord* himself for the Direction of his *Church* in all Ages, *his Manner* of performing it, is necessarily to be observ'd so far as He has given us Directions concerning it. For in an *Action* supposed to be *arbitrary*, and of Obligation only from its being *positively* commanded, any

Defect in the Conditions requir'd, manifestly destroys the *promised* Effect of the whole.

EVERY Thing therefore recorded concerning our Saviour's *Manner* of performing this *Holy Action*, must be understood to be a Part of his Command to those, who were to imitate Him herein. Since therefore, every one of the four Sacred Writers who have recorded the *Institution*, agree in affirming, that our *Blessed Saviour*, when He took the *Bread* and *Wine* into his Hands, did before He gave the same to his Disciples, distinctly *bless them*, or by some Form of Words *appoint* them to their intended *Holy Use*, it must be as necessary to imitate Him in *this Part* of the *Action*, as in any other. Now it is remarkable, that whilst *two* of the *sacred Writers* only, make any mention of the *Remembrance*, they *all* specify the *Blessing of the Elements*: Which *Circumstance* is of no small Weight, and deserves a particular Regard; and tho' it does not make the *Remembrance* in any respect the less necessary; yet it affords a strong Reproof to those, who, in favour to their own Prejudices, will presume to deny the *Necessity* of observing

serving that Part of *this Action*, which is so particularly recorded by them all.

WHEN you therefore here say, “ that  
 “ it is the Communicant ALONE, who must  
 “ by his own inward Thought and Appli-  
 “ cation of his Mind to the *Remembrance*  
 “ of *Christ*, make *this Bread* and *this Wine*,  
 “ different to Himself from *Bread* and *Wine*  
 “ taken at a Common Meal,” you put an  
 unworthy *Slight* upon that *Consecration* of  
 them for this Holy Purpose, which is per-  
 form’d by God’s *Minister*. For altho’ that  
*Consecration* will indeed do the *Communicant*  
 no service, if He does not partake of what  
 is so consecrated, with a thankful *Remem-*  
*brance of Christ*; yet neither will what you  
 call this “ *Personal Appropriation of the Bread*  
 “ *and Wine to the Remembrance of Christ*, tho’  
 “ attended even with the most undisturbed  
 “ Application of Mind,” be of more Bene-  
 fit, if it be perform’d with a *design’d* and  
 contemptuous Neglect of that *other*, only  
 true and proper *Consecration* of them by the  
*Minister*. Because our Saviour’s *Example* in  
 the Manner of the external Performance of  
 this *Holy Action*, which He commanded his

*Disciples* to follow, has the self same Force for what is rightly called a *Consecration* of the *Bread* and *Wine*, that his *Words* have for directing the whole to be perform'd in *Remembrance* of Him. But this is not the only Slight you have here put upon what is *essential* to the *right* Celebration of this *Holy Ordinance*. For

II. SECONDLY, you plainly suppose every *Communicant*, to be a sufficient *Priest* for Himself; and altho' our Saviour only commissioned his *Apostles*, and those who could plead an Authority from them, for this Purpose; you have given this Power *indiscriminately* to all. And if you may happen to think, that, for the Preservation of *Order*, it may be convenient to confine to a *Few*, what is the right of *All*; yet you manifestly declare your Opinion, that this *Holy Ordinance* may be *rightly* perform'd, as to all the *Essentials* of it, without either *Consecration*, or *Priest*, if every one be but careful for Himself, to *appropriate* his *eating Bread*, and *drinking Wine* to the actual *Remembrance* of *Christ*.

NAY still farther, if the *Remembrance* of *Christ* alone, be the *Essence* of this *Duty*, as you more than once say, I do not see any *Necessity* that there can be, of using the *Elements* of *Bread* and *Wine* in this *Sacrament*, any more than of a *Consecration* of them by a *Priest*. The *whole Action* may be perform'd in any *Assembly* of *Christians*, by this *Appropriation* of *Bread* and *Wine* by an *inward Thought*, and *undisturb'd Application* of *Mind* to the *Remembrance* of our *Lord*, without any real, *oral eating* and *drinking* at all. To such *Absurdities* are Men led, when, in confidence of their own *Abilities*, they despise the *Authority* and *Judgment* of all past *Ages*, and *first* form their *Schemes*, and then seek out for *Arguments* to support them. I am now come to your *18th Proposition*.

XVIII. *Whether any Privileges and Benefits are annex'd to the partaking worthily of the Lord's Supper, and what they are, that are annex'd to it; can appear only from the Words of the New Testament itself, or from the real Nature and End of this*



*this Institution, and what is necessarily included in it.*

YOU tell us, “ before you proceed to  
 “ make any Remark upon the *Passages* al-  
 “ ready produced, you think it just to men-  
 “ tion *one* more, in regard to the Judg-  
 “ ment of some good Interpreters who  
 “ think it relates to this Subject.”\* The  
*Passage* is this. 1 Cor. 12. 13. *For by one*  
*Spirit are we all baptized into one Body; whe-*  
*ther we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond*  
*or free, and have been all made to drink into*  
*one Spirit.* “ In order to find out the true  
 “ Meaning of this Text,” you observe right-  
 “ ly, “ that we ought to consider both the  
 “ Words and Phrases made use of; and the  
 “ main Design of the *Writer* in the whole  
 “ *Passage*, to which it belongs.” Well then;  
 let us see how you have executed these  
 Points. You observe,

I. FIRST, that “ the Words themselves  
 “ are such, as St. *Paul* can hardly be sup-  
 “ posed to make use of, concerning the  
 “ *Lord's Supper.*”† But why? because “ the

\* Pag. 133.

† Pag. 134.

“ par-

“ partaking of this *Rite*, was never by *Him*,  
 “ nor by any other Writer in the New  
 “ Testament, represented by that *one* parti-  
 “ cular Part of it which consists in *drinking*  
 “ in Remembrance of the *Bloud of Christ* :” \*  
 “ And ” because “ this *drinking* at the Lord’s  
 “ Table was never once by *Him*, nor any  
 “ other *sacred Writer*, expressed by being  
 “ *made to drink* into the *Spirit* of God, or  
 “ any Thing like it. On the contrary,  
 “ He himself, in the two foregoing *Chap-*  
 “ *ters*, speaks of this Part of that *Holy Rite*,  
 “ in plain Words, and very different Lan-  
 “ guage, without once mentioning this  
 “ *drinking of*, or *into* the *Spirit*, or any  
 “ Thing equivalent to it.” And that “ it  
 “ can hardly be thought, that He would  
 “ change his Way of speaking ” ——— or  
 “ that He would, “after He had quitted the  
 “ Subject of the *Lord’s Supper*, return to it,  
 “ without any Notice.” ———

HERE one may see, how very little will  
 convince a Man, when He is already re-  
 solv’d upon his Conclusion. For in all  
 these Words, there is not the least *Shew*

\* Pag. 135.

of an Argument. For what if the *whole* of this *Ordinance* is not represented any where else in the *sacred* Writings, under the Expression of *drinking in Remembrance of the Bloud of Christ*? Is there however any Way of speaking more allow'd, than that, whereby the *Whole* of a Thing is represented by the mention of a *principal* Part? Is not the other *Sacrament* of *Baptism* twice spoken of \*, as performed *in the Name of the Lord Jesus*? and is it not universally agreed, that the *Baptism* there mentioned is meant of the *Baptism* appointed by *Christ*, in the Name of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*, tho' one Person only is mentioned? And was it ever made an Objection to the understanding it so, because this *Expression* is peculiar to those two Places, and is to be met with no where else in the *Holy Bible*? Is not this very *Ordinance* of the *Lord's Supper* describ'd by the single Action of *breaking Bread*? and do not you your self make it a Question, whether it be certainly used in that Sense more than once or twice?†

\* *AAs* 2. 38.

*AAs* 19. 5.

† *Pag.* 92, 93.

2. To as little Purpose of Argument is your second Remark, — That “ this *drinking* “ at the Lord’s Table is never by any sacred Writer express’d by being made to “ drink into the Spirit of God.” For it is to be observ’d, that altho’ it is a significant Manner of speaking, to describe a Thing by its chief and *principal Effect*, yet, it not being so direct a Way of speaking as many others, it is no wonder, that among the few Instances in Scripture where this Holy *Ordinance* is spoken of, this is the only one where this form of Expression is observed. But in the Place under consideration, the Subject St. *Paul* was upon, did naturally lead him to the Expression, as being greatly pertinent to what He is discoursing of, as shall be shewn presently.

3. WHAT you farther remark of the Improbability of the *Apostle’s* using a different manner of speaking from what He had done, in the foregoing *Chapters*, and that He shou’d “ return to the Subject of the Lord’s Supper without Notice, so soon after He had quitted it,” is still wider from the Purpose. For does our *Apostle*, or any other good

Q

Wri-

To

ter confine himself always to the same Manner of speaking upon the same Subject? Does not a *diversity* of Phrase very often give not only Ornament, but Light also and Perspicuity to an Argument? In the present Case the Phrase is *chang'd*, because an Expression to the particular Sense and Meaning of that which is here used, was the only one that could be of Service in the *Apostle's* Argument. And as to his sudden returning to the *Subject* He had before been discoursing of, and *had quitted*, the Fact is not as you represent it. He had indeed been in the foregoing *Chapters* discoursing at large upon the *Lord's Supper*, and He had quitted the same, from the Time of his Entrance upon this *Chapter*; but does He here *resume* the Subject? He makes no mention at all of it but *occasionally*, and as it serv'd the Purpose of the *new Subject* He had entered upon. He *alludes* indeed to that great *salutary Effect* of this *Ordinance*, the Communication of the 'Help and Influences of God's *Holy Spirit*; but He makes no Manner of *Enlargement* upon the Point; and tho' He asserts the Thing *expressly* and *emphatically*, yet 'tis intirely in pursuit of a

Dis-



Discourse, and in Proof of an Argument,  
upon a quite *different* Subject.

YOU next observe, that “the mention  
“ of *Baptism*, in the former Part of the  
“ same *Verse*, is no Argument at all that  
“ the *Lord's Supper* must be intended in the  
“ latter Part of it \*. 'Tis *certainly* no Ar-  
gument considered in it self; but it may be  
a very *cogent* one, when the occasion of the  
mention of them *both* is taken into Consi-  
deration, which shall be done in its proper  
Place. You add — that “it ought here to  
“ be observ'd, that the giving of the *Spirit*,  
“ *that is*, the extraordinary Gifts of it, was  
“ so closely join'd, in the very first Days  
“ of the *Gospel*, to *Baptism* it self (general-  
“ ly following upon the Imposition of the  
“ *Apostle's* Hands presently after it) that this  
“ alone will account for the speaking of  
“ the *drinking of*, or *into*, the *Spirit*, in the  
“ same Sentence with *Baptism*.” † Whether  
it will account for it or no, will appear  
presently; in the mean Time if it will, this  
is no manner of Argument, that it may

\* Pag. 135.

† Pag. 136.

not be accounted for, by another and better Way.

YOU next say, that you do not “see  
 “ how the *Greek Word*, here used immediately  
 “ ly after that of *having been baptized*, can  
 “ signify any Thing depending upon repeated Acts of ordinary Duty. For as the  
 “ Phrase — *We have been baptized*, refers  
 “ to one single *Rite*, by which *Christians*  
 “ are declar’d to be *one Body*; so, the Phrase  
 “ — *We have been made to drink into one*  
 “ *and the same Spirit*, must naturally refer  
 “ to one single past Fact, after that *Baptism*.”\*  
 This is a Subtilty that no one could have had recourse to, whose Cause was not desperate; for altho’ it may *amuse* the unthinking, it can only serve to *provoke* Men of Skill and Understanding, to be thus treated, as if they were to accept every Thing from you as a Reason, without *Examination*. For it is perfectly the same Thing to the Apostle’s Argument, whether there be this *Similitude* which you speak of between the two Things here mention’d, or no. Baptism being but *once* to be perform’d, and

the partaking of the *Lord's Supper* being frequently to be repeated, makes no sort of Alteration in the Point, wherein the *Apostle* is concern'd. His Argument turns upon quite another Matter, and that is, (as shall be demonstrated presently) that the Effects of *Baptism*, and of *drinking* into the *Holy Spirit of God*, are communicated to *all* the true Members of Christ's Church, and that they alike proceed from the same *blessed Spirit*. So that this Subtilty of yours has no Place here at all, and 'tis alledg'd without so much as the *Appearance* of Reason.

NOR does what you afterwards say, in the least help the Matter, when you affirm, that "the *Apostle's* Manner of speaking leads us to think thus;"\* because He speaks of a Thing *certain*, whereas the Effect of "*drinking in the Communion* does undoubtedly depend upon the Temper and "good Behaviour of *Christians*, at every "Participation of the *Lord's Supper*." I say this does not help the Matter, because there is nothing in this peculiar to the *Lord's Supper*, it being certain that the Effects and In-

\* Pag. 136, 137.

fluences of the *Holy Spirit* are no more received by those who are *baptized* being *Adults*, without previous *Faith* and *Repentance*, than by those who partake of the *Lord's Supper* without those Qualifications. And what you farther insinuate, that it was not likely that the *Apostle* should speak to the *Corinthians* of any certain *visible* good Effects of the "Participation of the *Lord's* "*Supper* among them, after the very different Language concerning this *Rite*, and "the sharp Reproofs of the Conduct of "many of them, in their Attendance upon it, which He had before made use of;" This Insinuation, I say, has no Force, but upon your Manner of explaining what the *Apostle* had before delivered upon this Subject. And I think I need not add any Thing to shew how inconclusive that Argument must be, that subsists upon an *Interpretation* that has already in so large a Manner been shewn to be utterly groundless and absurd. \*

You still venture upon one Argument more to strengthen your Sense of this *Passage*; but it is with so much distrust, as if

\* Second Part.

you

you thought your self 'twas hardly worth mentioning. You say, "*you might add*, that  
 " in Propriety of Language, had the *Apostle*  
 " intended to speak of repeated Acts of par-  
 " taking of the *Cup* of the *Lord*, He would  
 " have used the Word [ $\pi\omicron\pi\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\delta\alpha$ ] in the  
 " *Present Tense*, to signify that we are by our  
 " repeated Attendance at the Lord's Table,  
 " frequently made to *drink of*, or *into*, the  
 " *Spirit*; and not [ $\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\mu\delta\upsilon$ ] *we have been*  
 " *made to drink of*, or *into*, it; which answer-  
 " ing exactly to [ $\epsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\mu\delta\upsilon$ ] *we have been*  
 " *baptized*, must probably, (as this latter  
 " does) refer to one Fact, stated and certain."

It appears by your whole Management in the Examination of this Text, that you was resolv'd to pass over nothing, that might have any *Tendency*, how remote soever, to the serving your Point; as if you hoped that a number of Arguments, tho' weak when *singly* taken, might in the *Lump* give Strength to your Cause. Otherwise, how could you think it to your Purpose to argue, against the Application of this Word,  $\epsilon\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\mu\delta\upsilon$ , to the *Lord's Supper*, only because it is express'd *indefinitely*? *Apostles* are known to have their very Name from their uncertain

Nota-



*Notation* of the Time when the Things spoken of are done; and they are not only commonly used to denote the Time *present* as well as *past*, but if the Time present is not particularly spoken of (as in the Case before us) but a Repetition of Facts continually returning, *that* Circumstance is express'd with as much Propriety by an *Aorist*, as by a Word in the *Present Tense*.

OUR Translators of the *Bible* were good Judges of the Greek Language; and there are not many fewer than twenty Places in this very *Epistle*, where they have translated *Aorists* in the *present Tense*. The notoriety of the Case supercedes the necessity of *Quotations*. I cannot however forbear making *one*, because it is so directly to the Point in hand. The *Passage* is 1 Cor. 4. 13. — ὡς ὀψιμαδάματα τῷ κόσμῳ ἐγενήθημεν, πάντων ὀψιψήμα ἕως ἄρτι. — *We ARE MADE as the Filth of the World, and the offscouring of all Things unto this Day*. Where the Treatment the *Apostles* and first *Christians* met with from the Enemies of the *Christian Name* is express'd by an *Aorist*, in the same precise Meaning, in which the Word [ἐπιτί-  
νυμεν]

ὡς μὲν] is here used, that is, as signifying not one single Act of Persecution either past or present, but a *Series* and Succession of Cruelties from the Time of their professing *Christianity* to the Moment of *St. Paul's* writing this *Epistle*. I think I may venture to say, you have been very unsuccessful upon this *Head* hitherto; let us see whether you have better Luck in what follows.

YOU next tell us, that the Point “will be put *beyond doubt*, by the plain Design of *St. Paul* in this whole Chapter.”\* And in setting this Design before your *Readers*, you observe, 1. First, that after the *Apostle* “has made an End of his Directions and Observations relating to the *Lord's Supper*,” “He introduces a perfectly new Subject” — *Now as concerning spiritual Gifts, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant*†. — By which you insinuate, that the *Apostle* being thus got upon a *new* Subject, it is not reasonable to suppose, that He should so soon return to the *old* one, which He had so fully discoursed upon before. But this, as I have already shew'd, is a *Misrepresentation*.

\* Pag. 138.

† 1 Cor. 12. 1.

tion of the Case: As the *Apostle* has begun a new Subject, so 'tis certain, He keeps very closely to it, and what He says of the *Lord's Supper*, is no Digression to the Subject He had quitted, but is of great Importance to, and makes a necessary Part in the *new* Argument He is discoursing upon. So that this Observation of yours is altogether without Foundation, and serves rather to deceive, than instruct your *Readers*; since what is here said by *St. Paul* concerning the *Lord's Supper*, is said *occasionally*, and in Proof of the *new* Point He had enter'd upon, and as a Matter that He had *before* explained, but now made use of as a Principle *known* and incontest'd, and therefore fit to be here used, (as it is) for the Proof and Illustration of something else.

2. You next observe, that the *Apostle*  
 “ puts the *Corinthians* in mind of the dif-  
 “ ferent Sorts of *Gifts* or *Graces*, all given  
 “ by the same *Spirit*, for the Good and Ad-  
 “ vantage of the whole Body of *Christians*.”  
 And that, “ in going over the particular  
 “ *Gifts* in his View, He does not mention  
 “ any of the *moral Virtues*, as the *Gifts* He  
 “ here

“ here means : Such as are call’d in other  
 “ Places \* καρποὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, *the Fruits*  
 “ of the Spirit, but mentions only χάρισματ<sup>α</sup>,  
 “ the uncommon Favours and Graces, in  
 “ another Sense, as peculiarly bestow’d up-  
 “ on some particular Persons — such as  
 “ an extraordinary Faith, in order to work  
 “ Miracles, the Gift of healing Diseases, the  
 “ Power of discerning the Spirits of others.”†

— Now this is full as little to the Pur-  
 pose as the foregoing Observation. For  
 altho’ the Apostle’s Discourse in this Chap-  
 ter be allow’d to concern the *spiritual Gifts*  
 of God to his Church in the first Ages of  
 it, whereby Men were enabled to do ex-  
 traordinary Works for the Propagation and  
 Establishment of the Gospel; and that it was  
 his Design here, to persuade those who were  
 endow’d with such Gifts, to use them all  
 for the good of the whole Christian Society;  
 yet it cannot be deny’d, but in the Course  
 and Prosecution of this Subject He might  
 very properly and suitably to his Argument,  
 take occasion to affirm, that all Christians are  
 influenced both in their Baptism, and in the  
 Supper of the Lord, by the same Holy Spirit,

\* Gal. 5. 22. Eph. 5. 8.

† Pag. 139.

who is the giver of those *extraordinary Gifts*, which are the confess'd Subject of this whole *Chapter*. And in this Case, altho' there is no particular mention of the *moral Virtues*, for which there was no occasion offer'd; and altho' there is no Intimation given of his speaking here concerning any other *Gifts*, but the *extraordinary* ones before mention'd; yet He may however in pursuit of his Argument upon the *extraordinary Gifts*, affirm what amounts to the full Meaning of those other *Gifts* and *Graces*, (which you call the *moral Virtues*) being all the Effect of *drinking into the Holy Spirit of God in the Lord's Supper*. So that allowing your Representation of the general Scope of the *Apostle* in this *Chapter* to be true; you are still as far as ever from *clearing* your Point, unless you can shew, that the Words under Consideration cannot bear a just Part in the *Argument*, and yet be at the same Time understood as spoken concerning the *End* and Effects of the *Lord's Supper*.

YOU proceed and say, "thus after the "*Apostle* has mention'd the *extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit*" v. 4. — 11. He comes  
to



to his "Argument, by which He designs  
 " to persuade all Persons concern'd, to use  
 " these *extraordinary* Gifts, according to the  
 " Design of the giver, for the good of the  
 " whole Society."\* You then give your  
*Paraphrase* of the 12th and 13th Verses,  
 which I will transcribe, after I have first  
 laid the Words themselves before the *Reader*,  
 as they are in the *Original* and our *Trans-*  
*lation.*

12. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστὶ, καὶ μέλη  
 ἔχει πολλὰ, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τῷ σώματι  
 τῷ ἑνὸς, πολλὰ ὄντα, ἓν ἐστὶ σῶμα· ὕψω καὶ ὁ  
 Χριστός.

13. Καὶ γὰρ ὅτι ENI ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΙ ἡμεῖς  
 ΠΑΝΤΕΣ εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν; εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι,  
 εἴτε Ἕλληες, εἴτε δοῦλοι, εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι· Καὶ  
 ΠΑΝΤΕΣ εἰς ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.

12. For as the Body is one, and hath many  
 Members, and all the Members of that one  
 Body, being many, are one Body, so also is  
 Christ.

13. For by ONE SPIRIT are we ALL Bar-  
 tized into one Body, whether we be Jews or

*Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been ALL made to drink into one Spirit.*

YOUR *Paraphrase* upon these Words is this, v. 12. "As it is in the natural Body, " so it is with the *Christian Society*. We are " to consider our selves as many Members " composing one Body; and obliged to " act for the good of the whole." " For v. 13. " We have all been *baptized*, and " by that *Rite*, declar'd to make *one Body* or " *Society*, and it is *one* and the *same Spirit*, " of which all of us, who have been fa- " vour'd with these extraordinary Gifts, " have been made to *drink*, for the use of " the Church; and by which every Part of " the Church is to be benefited: just as in " the *natural Body*, all Members partake of " the same Life, from one and the same " Principle."\* Upon the whole you roundly conclude, "that in the *Passage* before us, " in which St. Paul declares the *Christians* " to have been made to drink into the *same Spirit*, He had not the *moral Virtues* in his " View, as the Effect of that or any other " drinking, but the extraordinary *Graces* or Fa-

\* Pag. 139.

“ *yours* call’d in this Chapter *χαρίσματα*, and  
 “ in the next *τὰ πνευματικά*, *Spiritual Gifts* —  
 “ And that He is not here speaking at all  
 “ of the Attendance of *Christians*, upon the  
 “ Lord’s Table.”\*

HAVING fairly and fully represented to the *Reader* what you have offer’d in order to justify your Sense of this *Passage*, I desire his Attention whilst I lay before Him what I think exceptionable in it. And I do not despair of making every *impartial* Person fully sensible, both that your Conclusion is groundless, and also that the Arts you have used to come at it, are *unfair*, and *indefensible*.

I. FIRST, the Text says — *By ONE SPIRIT are we all baptized, into one Body*. You give the Meaning of these Words by the following, — “ We have all been *baptized*, “ and by that *Rite*, declar’d to make *one* “ *Body*, or *Society*.” — And in your other *Paraphrase* of the same Words, you give the Sense by Words to the same Effect — “ By “ *Baptism* we have been all declar’d Mem-

\* Pag. 141.

“ bers

“ bers of the one *Christian* Society, Christ’s  
 “ mystical Body.”\* So that, if there be any  
 material Omission here, the Repetition will  
 seem a Proof that the Omission was made  
 with design. And yet the Words *by one*  
*Spirit* [ὁ ἐν πνεύματι] are quite drop’d, as  
 if they were altogether redundant, came  
 there the Apostle himself knew not why,  
 and had no share in fixing the Sense of the  
 Place. Whatever was your Reason for this  
 Omission, the Words are most certainly a  
 Part of the *Text*, and the *true* Meaning of  
 it cannot be known, without restoring them  
 to their proper Place; and the omitting the  
 Consideration of them, as you have done,  
 is, I think, a Liberty not very usually ta-  
 ken by *Commentators*, is I am sure unjustifi-  
 able and not to be born. But farther,

2. *SECONDLY*, in giving your *Interpreta-*  
*tation* of this *Text*, you omit the mention  
 of that universality, which is observable in  
 both the Members of this *Passage*, and up-  
 on the preserving which the true Sense of  
 it intirely depends, and which being pre-  
 served does absolutely exclude that Sense

you have put upon it. The Text says expressly — *By one Spirit are we ALL baptized. And we have been ALL made to drink into one Spirit.* Now surely every fair *Interpreter* should preserve this *universality* in these two Propositions, and should represent the *Apostle* as making the *drinking* into *one Spirit*, as extensive as the being *baptized* by *one Spirit*; or, in other Words, (and they are the very Words of the Text) as affirming, that ALL have been *baptized* by one Spirit, and that ALL have been made to *drink* into *one Spirit*. Because this is the *Apostle's* Assertion in as direct Terms as can be used, and doubtless, was made by Him for very good Reasons, and is not to be varied at the Will of every *Expositor*. And yet you have crowded in several Words on purpose to qualify and limit this *universality* expressed by the Word ΠΑΝΤΕΣ, ALL, whereby you make the Sense the same, as if it had been omitted. For in your *Paraphrase* page 139. you say thus — “ It is one and the same Spirit of which all of us — WHO HAVE BEEN FAVOUR'D WITH THESE EXTRAORDINARY GIFTS, have been made to drink.” And in your *Paraphrase* p.



142. you say "All we WHO HAVE BEEN  
 " ENDOW'D WITH THE EXTRAORDINARY  
 " GIFTS " — "had them bestow'd upon  
 " us by one and the same Spirit". For by  
 thus confining this *drinking into one Spirit* to  
 those only who were endow'd with *extra-*  
*ordinary Gifts*, which you elsewhere call  
 (p. 140.) *uncommon Favours or Graces, pecu-*  
*liarly bestow'd upon some particular Persons, and*  
*not common to all even in those Days*, you do  
 as effectually destroy the *universality*, here  
 so emphatically and expressly asserted, as if  
 you had expung'd the Word ΠΑΝΤΕΣ,  
 ALL, out of the *Text*.

IF *Interpreters* are to be indulged in such  
 a Licentiousness as this is, no Authors  
 Sense can be secure. And the *critical Art*  
 hitherto so justly in repute, will be render'd  
 useless at once. For to what Purpose is  
 it to take Pains to settle the true *Reading*  
 of any *Text*, if we may after all have the  
 Liberty of putting in or leaving out what  
 Words we think fit, as may best serve the  
 most *laudable* Purpose of supporting an *Hy-*  
*pothesis*. These Steps that you have taken  
 in order to get at the Construction you put  
 upon

upon this *Passage*, are so very uncommon, that one would be apt to imagine, that it must at least be very agreeable to the Scope of the *Apostle* in this Place, and must mightily help and strengthen his Reasoning. And yet just contrary to this, I will now shew,

3. THIRDLY, that it serves only to disable the Argument you your self allow the *Apostle* to be maintaining, and to render it *precarious*. It is agreed, that the Design of the *Apostle* in this *Chapter* is to shew, that all the *extraordinary Gifts* of God to diverse Members of his *Church*, were not given for the *Benefit* of those *only*, who were honour'd with them, but for the Advantage and Improvement of all: that how different soever *these Gifts* were in kind, they were all the Effects of one and the same Spirit, for the emolument of the whole *Christian Society*: and that after He has enumerated these Gifts, and ascrib'd them all to the same *Spirit*, He comes at the 12th and 13th Verses to argue for the *use* of them, "according to the Design of the giver, for the good of the whole Society." \*

\* Pag. 139.

LET us then now see how the *Apostle* will appear to argue upon your Representation of the Sense of his Words in this Place. — All the extraordinary *Gifts* of the *Spirit* before mentioned, are given for the general use of the *Church*, — because *we are all baptized into one Body* — and because — all these extraordinary *Gifts*, how different soever in kind, do all flow from the *same Spirit*. — Now the *first* Reason is not sufficient for the Proof of the Point; because altho' there is a *Union* of the Members of *Christ's* Body supposed; yet there is no mention, who is the *Agent*, or by whose *Power* and *Influence* the *Union* is made; and consequently it does not appear, that it was by the *Power* of the *same Spirit* that had granted these *extraordinary Gifts*; and how are we then to conclude that these *extraordinary Gifts* were designed for the use of *all* the Members of the *Church*, since there is nothing in the Argument that affirms *all* the Members of the *Church* to be under the Direction and Government of the *same Spirit*? If indeed this *Union* be supposed to be effected by the *Agency* and *Influence* of the *same Holy Spirit*, that bestow'd these *extraordinary*

*ordinary Gifts*, then the Argument is strong and cogent. For if it is the *same Spirit*, that admits all *Christians* to the *Benefit* of being Members of *Christ's Body* by *Baptism*, who gives *some* of these Members these *extraordinary Gifts*; it is justly argued, that the same *Holy Spirit* will favour no particular Persons with *any Gifts*, that may be used for the good of others, but with an Intention that they should be so used, He being *thus* supposed to be the common *Advocate*, *Helper* and *Sanctifier* of ALL. By dropping therefore the mention of *the same Spirit*, in the *first Clause* you have render'd the Apostle's reasoning *precarious*.

AND the Case is the same with regard to the *Second Clause*. For when you make the Reason of the *Apostle's Conclusion* for the necessity of *Christians* using the *extraordinary Gifts* of the *Spirit* for the good of the whole *Church*, to be this only, because these Gifts how different soever in kind, do all flow from the *same Spirit*, the force of the Consequence is plainly wanting. For what is alledg'd can prove no more, than that *they*, who receive one or more of *these extraordinary*

*extraordinary Gifts*, ought to make the *Gifts* received useful to *such* of their Brethren as are endow'd with the *like extraordinary Gifts*, thro' the favour of the *same Spirit*. But those particular Members who are neither endowed with these *extraordinary Gifts*, nor affirm'd to be any other Way influenc'd by, or *made to drink into the same Spirit*, have no ground in *this Argument* to plead, that *these Gifts* are afforded for *their Use* and Advantage, there being nothing here said concerning any Relation that *they* have to the Author of them. For the Foundation of the Argument must be *this*, and *this only*; — That they who are *not* honour'd with these *extraordinary Gifts*, do however partake of the *Holy Spirit* of God, as well as they who are *thus* honoured — That even *all these* are made to *drink* into the *Holy Spirit*, as well as *they*; and therefore by virtue of their Relation to the *same Spirit*, may justly claim a right to the Benefit of these *extraordinary Gifts*, in common with *those* upon whom they were particularly bestowed. And this will appear plainer, if these mutilated Arguments are first laid before the Reader in the *Syllogistical* Form,

and



and then what is defective in them is supplied in the same Manner.

THE Point to be proved is — That all the *extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit* are design'd for the use of *all Christians*.

FIRST Argument — All the *extraordinary Gifts* of the *Holy Spirit* are designed for the use of all those “who are baptized, “and declared to make one Body” — But all *Christians* are *baptized* and declared to make *one Body* — Therefore &c. Now the *major Proposition* here, tho' true, is not so from any Thing yet mentioned; and tho' it is capable of Proof by a *new Medium*, yet it remains precarious, till the Truth of it is cleared by the aid of another *Syllogism*, which is this. — All the *extraordinary Gifts* of the *Spirit* are designed for the use of *all* those who are baptized into one Body, *by one* or *by the same Spirit*, who is the Author of all those *extraordinary Gifts*; but all *Christians* are baptized into one Body *by one* or *by the same Spirit*, who is the Author of all those *extraordinary Gifts*; Therefore &c. By which it is evident, the Apostle's  
Argu-

Argument is render'd conclusive, only by restoring to their proper Place the very Words you have thought fit to *exclude*.

SECOND Argument ——— Whatsoever Gifts flow from *the same Spirit* of God, are all designed for the general use of the *Church*; ——— But all the extraordinary Gifts of God do flow from *the same Spirit of God*; Therefore &c. Here the Conclusion again is uncertain, for want of what the *Apostle* himself *mentions*, but you have been pleased to *omit*. The following Syllogism will *restore* the Argument to the Strength the *Apostle's* own Words give it. ——— Whatsoever Gifts flow from the *same Spirit* of God, into which all *Christians have been made to drink*, are all design'd for the general use of the *Church*; But the extraordinary Gifts of God do all flow from the *same Spirit* of God, into which *all Christians have been made to drink*; — Therefore &c. I hope I shall be excused by the *Reader* for taking up so much of his Time, in order to make this your *fallacious* Treatment of the *Apostle's* Argument as evident as was possible. And tho' I may have tir'd the *Reader*, I am certain I have gain'd

gain'd my Point against you by the Means, and have shewn, that whatever may at last be the true Sense of this *Passage*, your Interpretation of it is certainly and demonstrably *false*. It is proper now

4. FOURTHLY, to inquire into, and settle if we can, the *true* Meaning of this *Passage*. It has been already observ'd, and it is agreed among all, that the Words under Consideration are brought as a Proof that all the *extraordinary Gifts* of God were design'd not for the particular use of those who were honoured with them, but for the general Advantage of all\*. It is confess'd also, that the *drinking into the Spirit* here spoken of, does import a Participation of the Gifts of the Spirit; you allow the same, only you confine this *drinking into the Spirit* to a Participation of the *extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit* only†. Now it has been *fully* shewn, that this *Interpretation* cannot be true; because the *drinking into the Spirit* here spoken of, is affirm'd to be as *universal* as the partaking of the same

\* Ἐκάστῳ δι' ὁδοῦ αὐτῆς χάρις καὶ ἐνεργεῖαι τοῦ πνεύματος ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ ἐκαστῷ. 1 Cor. 12. 7.

† Pag. 139.

Spirit by *Baptism* is: so that unless the *drinking into the Spirit* means the same Thing with partaking of the *Spirit* in *Baptism*, under a different Expression, it remains, that nothing else can be meant by it but a partaking of the Influences of the *Holy Spirit* in the *Lord's Supper*. Now that the Communication of the *Holy Spirit* in *Baptism*, is not meant by the Expression of *drinking into the Spirit*, it is highly reasonable to think; because the *Apostle* must then be supposed, in a very short Argument, to have used two Expressions for the same Thing, without any occasion, at the same Time too that he has sufficiently guarded against being so understood, by such a *Connection* of the two *Phrases*, as manifestly imports a *distinction* between them — *We have been baptized, AND we have been made to drink.* Above all, because the Term of *drinking into the Spirit* cannot with *Propriety* be apply'd to *Baptism*, but may with singular Significancy be apply'd to the *Lord's Supper*, wherein the *Action* of *drinking* is known to be one *eminent* and *necessary* Part of the *Duty*.

UPON the whole therefore as your *Interpretation* of this *Passage*, is, for the Reasons before given, to be rejected, even with Indignation; so I think I may securely conclude, that they who explain it to the Sense of there being a true and effectual *Influence* of the *Spirit* of God upon *Christians* in the use of both *Ordinances* — *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, do it, in perfect Agreement with the obvious and natural Construction of the *Words*, with the *Scope* and Design of the whole *Chapter*, and with the plain *Purpose* of the Argument contained in the *Passage* it self. After you have done with this *Passage* you tell us, that “if we review all the *Passages* of the New Testament before produced, we shall find only one of them supposed by any *Interpreters* to imply in it, any immediate *Benefit* or *Privilege* annex'd to the partaking of this *Rite*, viz. that of *St. Paul*, in which the partaking of the *Cup* and of the *Bread* at the *Lord's Table*, is said to be the Communion of the *Bloud* and of the *Body* of *Christ*,” And will you venture so positively to affirm, what you may be confuted in, from your own express *Words*, at no



greater Distance than that of a very few Pages? For have you not declar'd, that the Words of St. Paul, in the Passage last consider'd — have been *interpreted* by some [Mr. Locke and others] “ to relate to *drinking* the “ Bloud of *Christ* in the *Lord's Supper*; and “ by that Bloud, commemorated in that “ Religious *Rite*, being made to have all “ one Life or Spirit — and by others, “ to signify the *Participation* of the moral “ *Fruits*, or *Graces*, of God's Holy Spirit, by “ means of receiving the *Cup* in the *Lord's* “ *Supper*? \*

WHAT an inconsistency is here? and how reproachful is it to you thus to *say* and *unsay*, only as you think it will best suit the Purpose of your Argument? The Truth of the Matter is, almost *all* those *Passages* you have examin'd have been by many good *Interpreters* supposed to imply in them those very *Benefits* and *Privileges* as annexed to this *Ordinance*, which you now deny them to have supposed concerning any other *Passage* but that of St. Paul — where the partaking of the *Cup* and of the *Bread*

at the *Lord's Table* — is said to be “ the Com-  
 “ munion of the *Bloud* and of the *Body* of  
 “ *Christ*.” This indeed you *still* “ acknow-  
 “ ledge, has been *interpreted* by many to  
 “ signify an actual partaking of *all* the Be-  
 “ nefits of his Sufferings and Death for our  
 “ Sakes.” Many indeed, and of the first  
 Distinction for Learning and Judgment have  
 grounded a *Title* to a Share in the *Benefits*  
 of *Christ's* Sufferings, from the *Communion*  
 of the *Body* and *Bloud* of *Christ* in his *Supper*.  
 And I think I may safely trust with the  
*Reader* what I have at large offered in the  
 close of my *First Part*, in support of this  
 Notion, and in Confutation of what you  
 have argued against it in the 39<sup>th</sup> and fol-  
 lowing *Pages* of your Book. However, you  
 having here resumed the Subject, and en-  
 deavour'd to shew the inconsistency of that  
*Notion* with the Truth of the *Gospel*, and  
 the Terms of Acceptance with God, 'twill  
 be necessary to say something more here,  
 to remove the Prejudices which what you  
 have said will be apt to raise in some *Read-  
 ers*, and to clear the Subject from your un-  
 fair Representation of it.

You

You state the Matter, as if they who affirm the Benefits of Christ's Passion to be all ensur'd to *Christians* by a *worthy* Participation of the *Lord's Supper*, do thereby mean, that this single Action in Separation from, and independent of, all other Acts of Religion, did alone procure the *Favour* of God, and an actual Possession of the Blessings obtain'd by the *Sufferings* of our Lord. \* Now this is an utter Misrepresentation of the Case: for they who maintain the *Notion* you oppose, do not look upon this Act of *Obedience*, as more necessary than others, or as of any Efficacy without others. Nay, they are so far from ascribing any beneficial Power to this Act of Obedience *separately* considered, that if it be not preceded by, and attended with a *lively Faith*, and a *sincere Repentance*, they affirm it will subject those who shall partake of it, to the Punishment threaten'd by *St. Paul* to those who *eat and drink unworthily*. Indeed they maintain with the Compilers of our *Articles* and *Liturgy*, and all those who *subscribe* them in their obvious Meaning, that other Acts of Obedience will be defective without

\* Pag. 144, 145.

this; that as we are accepted by God, and Righteousness is imputed to us, thro' the *Merits* of *Christ*; so the Benefits of that Covenant of Grace obtain'd thro' his Bloud, are apply'd to particular Persons thro' the use of the Holy Ordinances of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, instituted for that Purpose; And that as Baptism is the *Rite* of Admission Into Covenant with God; so the *Lord's Supper* is the Means of reestablishing the same, when the *Privileges* of it have been forfeited by Sin; and that it is a continually returning Pledge and Assurance of the *Pardon* of Sin, the Assistance of God's *Holy Spirit*, and a blessed *Immortality* — There is no occasion for a distinct Proof of this here; these Things all follow from the supposed Truth of the *Interpretations* before given upon the several *Passages* that have fallen under Examination as pertaining to this Subject: And what needs farther to be added will be done more properly afterwards. I have therefore no more to do here, than to shew, that this does not *evacuate*, or any ways alter the *Terms* of *Salvation* as laid down in the *Gospel*, as you represent it to do.

YOU

YOU endeavour to exemplify the Truth  
 of what you say, by *one Instance* — “ The  
 “ *Benefit of Remission* of our past *Sins* thro’  
 “ *Jesus Christ*. If it be ask’d — Do we not  
 “ partake of this *Benefit* by our partaking  
 “ of the *Lord’s Supper* worthily ?” You say  
 “ you must answer, No ; if the *Gospel* be  
 “ true. For in *that*, no pardon of past *Sins*  
 “ is promis’d, or given, unless to those just  
 “ *baptized* into the *Christian Faith*, or to  
 “ *those* who having sinn’d after *Baptism*,  
 “ actually *amend* their Lives.” But how  
 does this prove the Point ? The Question  
 is, whether the Pardon of past *Sins* is af-  
 sur’d and convey’d to worthy *Communicants*  
 in the *Lord’s Supper*. You stake the Truth  
 of the *Gospel* upon it, that the Pardon of  
 Sin is not so assur’d and convey’d, because  
 the *Gospel* makes *Repentance* and *Amendment*  
 necessary for the obtaining this Blessing.  
 Well ; and are not *Repentance* and *Amend-*  
*ment* held to be necessary for this Purpose,  
 by these Persons whom you oppose, as well  
 as by your self ? How then does their Do-  
 ctine alter the Terms of Salvation any  
 more than yours, since they as distinctly  
 suppose the necessity of *Repentance* and *A-*  
*mendment*



*amendment*, and that they are the indispensable Conditions of Pardon, as you do? What you say therefore, serves only to lead your *Readers* into a wrong Notion of the *State* of the Question, that you may thence take occasion to load your Adversaries with an *Absurdity*, that they disavow, and which is no more a Consequence of *their* Doctrine, than yours.

THE Point in debate is, whether, upon the Supposition of *Repentance* and *Amendment*, an Application of the Merits of Christ by a *Communion* of his *Body* and *Bloud* in this Ordinance, is not according to the plain Meaning of the *Passages* of Scripture before examin'd, a *Seal* and *Pledge* of the Pardon of Sins committed after *Baptism*? You do not offer one *Syllable* to shew that this is not the Case, but take your Point for granted, and then in your next *Paragraph* call in the *Church* for a Voucher, and affirm, that in "our *Publick Office* it is not suppos'd, "that the worthy partaking of the *Lord's* "*Supper*, does it self operate this *Forgiveness*," because "it is made Part of a Prayer to God, that they who have *partaken*

V

of

“ of it, *may obtain* Remission of *their* Sins  
 “ and all other Benefits of Christ’s Passion.”\*

Now it is to be observ’d, that the Prayer from whence this is quoted, is the very *First* after the Lord’s Prayer, with which the *Post-Communion-Service* begins. So that, unless it had been a Part of the Words us’d at the Delivery of the *Elements*, it could not properly have been used sooner. For the nature of Things requiring, that the Parts of which the Office consists, should follow one another in Succession, I would fain know how this Petition could be placed more *suitably* than just where it is. To have made it a Part of the Form at the Delivery of the *Elements*, would have given a very inconvenient length to what is so frequently to be repeated. And to have made it precede the *Lord’s Prayer*, would by no means have been proper. As it therefore comes just after the *Act* of receiving, and is join’d to the mention of that Sacrifice of *Praise* and *Thanksgiving*, which is therein made, it ought to be accommodated *thereto*, as a *Prayer* of hope that no unworthiness in the manner of our receiving may defeat the Ap-

\* Pag 145.

plication of that Pardon to our selves and others, which we believe to be the promis'd Effect of a right Discharge of this *Duty*. And the Conduct of the *Church* in placing this Petition immediately after the *Solemnity* of receiving is over, and no where else, is a much better Argument of her thinking the Pardon of Sin to be convey'd to *faithful Penitents*, by this Action of *Communion*, than it can be, that She holds no such Doctrine, only because this Petition is not a Part of the Form used at the Delivery of the *Holy Elements*.

YOU next observe \*, that "agreeably to this, we ought to explain that *Passage* in the *Church Catechism*, in which it being ask'd, what is the *inward Part or Thing signify'd in the Lord's Supper*? The Answer is — *The Body and Bloud of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper.*" These Words you say, "for want of an equitable Explication, have been charg'd with an *Absurdity* equal to that of *Transubstantiation* it self." But yet, "that they cannot

\* Pag. 146.

“ be meant of *Christ's natural Body and Bloud*”, you say, “ every one who knows the Principles of the *Compilers of the Catechism*, “ and the Doctrine of our *Church*, not only allows, but contends.” Your Reason for clearing the Church from this Imputation is certainly just and unanswerable. But then for the self same Reason you ought to have allow'd, that the *Benefits of Christ's Body broken, and his Bloud shed*, are what the *Church* here most certainly understands to be verily and indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper. For every one, who knows any Thing of the Principles of the *Compilers of the Catechism*, and of the Doctrine of our *Church*, must allow, that they are as full and expresse for the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper's being the Means of conveying the *Benefits of Christ's Death* to worthy *Receivers*, as they are against the Absurdity of Transubstantiation. And of this her Homilies, Articles, and Liturgy are a strong, standing, unanswerable Proof.

THIS Notion of the *Compilers* appears also very fully from their other Compositions still remaining among us; from whence it would

would be easy to fill a *Volume*. But the Point is too apparent to need a particular Proof. I shall therefore make but *one* Quotation; But that is a pregnant Proof of the Matter in hand, and of it self *decisive*: It is from the most excellent and glorious *Martyr* Archbishop *Cranmer*, who is known to have had so great a Share, as in the whole *Reformation*, so particularly in directing and composing the Liturgy \*. These are his Words. "When I say, and repeat many  
 " Times in my Book, that the *Body* of Christ  
 " is present with them that worthily receive the *Sacrament*, lest any Man should  
 " Mistake my Words, and think that I  
 " mean, that altho' Christ be not corporally in the outward visible *Signs*, yet He  
 " is corporally in the Persons who duly  
 " receive them; this is to advertise the Reader, that I mean no such Thing. But my  
 " Meaning is, that the FORCE, the GRACE,  
 " the VIRTUE, and BENEFIT of Christ's  
 " *Body*, that was crucified for us, and of  
 " his *Bloud* that was shed for us, be really

\* Archbishop *Cranmer*'s Answer to *Gardiner*, in the 3<sup>d</sup> Paragraph of the Preface to the Reader.

" and



“ and effectually present with all them that  
 “ duly receive the *Sacrament* — No more  
 “ truly is Christ corporally or really present  
 “ in the due ministration of the *Lord's Sup-*  
 “ *per*, than He is in the due ministration  
 “ of *Baptism*; that is to say, in both SPI-  
 “ RITUALLY, by GRACE.

YOU tell us [p. 148.] that “ the only  
 “ consistent Sense of the Words we are  
 “ now considering, appears to be this, that  
 “ the *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, appointed  
 “ to be remembered in this *Rite*, may be said  
 “ to be receiv'd by the *Faithful*, as they a-  
 “ lone, sincerely and seriously eat this *Bread*  
 “ and drink this *Wine*, in memory of Christ's  
 “ *Body* and *Bloud*. And consequently, the  
 “ *Faithful* are said verily and indeed to take  
 “ and receive the *Body* and *Bloud*, because  
 “ Believers alone, coming as such, eat his  
 “ *Body* and drink his *Bloud* indeed, or in that  
 “ very Sense in which He appointed them  
 “ to do it; viz. by eating *Bread* and drink-  
 “ ing *Wine* in a thankful and serious Remem-  
 “ brance of his natural *Body* broken, and  
 “ *Bloud* shed.” So that altho' the Words  
 verily and indeed are plainly used by the  
 Church

Church to give an *Emphasis* to what she says concerning the *Reception* of the *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, as the *inward Part* of the Lord's Supper, and *the Thing signified* by the Bread and Wine, and thereby to affirm in the strongest manner the *Reality* of Christ's Presence, you understand the Words as thrown in by the Church only to guard her *Catechumens* against believing the *Lord's Supper* (consisting according to you only of Bread and Wine) to be truly and really as to the *End, Design*, and "in the Sense of the *Institution*", received by any *Christians* but the *faithful* only: Contrary both to the necessary Sense of the Words themselves, and to the obvious Design of the *Church* in proposing and answering this *Question*.

IF it had been the Design of the Church to have said what you would make her say, how easy was it for her to have said it, in the plainest manner? The Addition of the Word *only* had done it effectually. — *Which are verily and indeed taken ONLY by the Faithful* — But without this Addition, 'tis impossible that the Words can bear the Construction you put upon them.  
And

And if you or any one may have the Liberty of adding a Word at Pleasure to serve a Turn, 'tis in vain to ground an Argument upon any Modes of Writing or speaking whatsoever; Forasmuch as no Author's Sense can be secure against such *unwarrantable* methods of proceeding. But after all, if we should allow you to make the best of your Construction, can you serve your Cause thereby? Far from it; unless you will suppose the *Church* to instruct her *Disciples* in *Terms*, and by *Definitions* that have neither *Consistency* nor *Common Sense* in them. For altho' you allow, that the Faithful may be here said to *receive the Body and Bloud of Christ*; yet your whole Scheme demands, and you have consistently therewith here declar'd, that the *Body and Bloud* they receive is no other than *Bread and Wine*, the Signs and *Memorials* of his *Body and Bloud*: so that whatever the Church seems to say, you affirm directly, that the *Body and Bloud* of Christ, as distinct from their *Memorials*, are in no Sense receiv'd even by the *Faithful* in the *Lord's Supper*. But what says the Church? Why, after she has affirm'd, that in both *Sacraments* there is an *outward and visible*

*visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace given unto us; and that in the Lord's Supper, the outward Sign is Bread and Wine, and the Thing signify'd is the Body and Bloud of Christ; She then expressly declares, that as the Lord has commanded the Bread and Wine to be receiv'd, so also that the Faithful do therewith receive the Body and Bloud of Christ.*

ALL this is so plain and incontestable, that I cannot but wonder that you should say at last, that if what you have given for the Meaning of this *Passage* "be not the Sense of it, you own your self unable to say what is \*." For whether the Words, independently taken, will bear the Construction you give of them or no, 'tis certain, the Construction is neither consistent with the other Parts of the *Catechism*, nor with the Judgment and Sentiments of the *Compilers* of it. I think therefore, that if instead of the method you have taken, you had roundly declar'd, that there is neither *Sense* nor *Truth* in this *Definition* of the *Church*, as it is, and must be understood, you wou'd

\* Pag. 149.

have acted in a Manner less liable to Re-  
proach, than that is which you have chosen.

YOU next tell us, you think "It is not  
" truly affirm'd that the Participation of  
" the Benefits purchased by Christ's Death,  
" is by a very proper Figure of Speech in  
" *this* Sacrament styl'd the receiving of  
" Christ's *Body* and *Bloud*, as it is in the o-  
" ther, [*viz.* Baptism] styl'd a being *buried*  
" *with Christ*, and rising with *Him again*.  
" For," you say, " this latter Expression  
" made use of by St. Paul, with Relation  
" to *Baptism*, is taken from the Custom of  
" *Immersiōn* in the first Days — and that  
" if *Baptism* had been perform'd as it is now,  
" we should never have so much as heard  
" of this Form of Expression of *dying* and  
" *arising* again in this *Rite* \*." Now this  
is surely most unaccountable Reasoning.  
— "The being *buried with Christ*, and *rising*  
" *with Him again*, is not by a proper Figure  
" of Speech, styl'd a *Participation of the Be-*  
" *nefits purchased by Christ's Death* — Because  
these Words have an allusion to a *manner*  
of *baptizing* anciently practiced, but now

\* Pag. 150.

disused.



disused. — Can any Thing be weaker than this? For did the Point the *Apostle* is speaking of in this *Figurative* Manner, take its *Rise* and *Being*, from the Thing which afforded Him those *Images*, by which He illustrates and explains it? 'Tis allow'd, *Immersion* was the Thing that gave Him the occasion of using the Expressions He does; but was not the Effect of *Baptism*, the Point He is speaking of? And does He make use of these Expressions for any other Reason, but because of their *aptness* to represent the same? And will the Thing represented by them change its Nature, or lose its very Existence, because the Custom alluded to is now in disuse? You are certainly right, and no Body will dispute it with you, that if there had been then no such Custom as *Immersion*, the *Apostle* would not have made the *Allusion* to it, which He has done; but if that had been the Case, could his *Invention*, think you, have supply'd Him with no other *Similitude* to have explain'd this Matter by? And if nothing apt had offer'd it self, are you sure He would not have laid down the *same Doctrine* in *plain Terms*, without any *Figure* at all?

THE Point in Question is not, whether He alludes to *Immerſion* or not; much leſs, whether if there had then been no ſuch Practice, He would have uſed the *Figurative* Expreſſions He does; but whether the Expreſſions He *does* uſe in *alluſion* to the known Cuſtom of thoſe Times, may properly and aptly represent the Effect of *Baptiſm* to be “ a Participation of the Benefits purchaſed “ by Chriſt’s Death; and what you have offer’d to ſhew the contrary, is ſo far from being concluſive, that it is even *ridiculous*, and only ſerves to ſhew how a violent Attachment to an *Hypotheſis* will ſometimes throw a Miſt before the Eyes of Perſons not uſually defective in Point of Art and Subtilty.

BUT you ſay farther, “ This Figurative “ Expreſſion is not ever made uſe of, to “ ſignify any *Benefit* or *Privilege* actually “ obtain’d at the Time of receiving *Bap- “ tiſm* worthily, or by means of it, but “ peculiarly apply’d to the Duty and Obligation the baptized Perſon is reminded “ of, by this particular Manner of *Baptiſm*.” This indeed would have been to the Purpoſe,

pose, if it had been true; but it is really very *rashly* said, and without ground. St. Paul uses this Expression concerning the Power and Effect of *Baptism*, in the Epistle to the *Colossians*, 2. 11, 12. where, after mentioning the *Circumcision made without Hands*, as consisting in *putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh*, — He presently expresses this Effect by their being *buried with Christ in Baptism*, and being also *risen with Him*; and then assures the *Colossians* of the great *Benefit* accruing to them thereby, forasmuch as tho' before they were *dead in their Sins*, and the *Uncircumcision of their Flesh*, they were now *quickened together with Him*, God *having forgiven them all their Trespases*. (v. 13.) So far is it from being true that “this Figurative Expression is not ever made use of to signify any *Benefit* or *Privilege* actually obtain'd at the Time of receiving of Baptism worthily or by means of it.” And as to the Place you quote (*Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 11, 12.) altho' the Expression is indeed used to remind Christians of their Duty of walking in *Newness of Life*; yet 'tis certain the Argument the Apostle uses, is founded upon the Supposition of the

the very Fact which you deny, which is that they had been *baptized into the Death of Christ*, and had thereby receiv'd the Benefits of his *Death*, in the Pardon of Sin and the Succours of his Grace. For, says He, *how shall we who are dead to Sin* [by Baptism] *live any longer therein?* As to what you add concerning the other Form of Expression — *receiving the Body and Bloud of Christ*\*, and the Phrase of *eating Christ's Flesh*, and *drinking his Bloud*, in order to shew that the actual *Participation of the Benefits purchased by his Death*, is not signify'd thereby, I have already fully answer'd it in the Explications of those *Passages* to which you refer.

YOU next proceed to inquire, “ what “ those *Privileges or Benefits* are, which are “ truly and certainly annex'd to this Duty, “ or imply'd in it.”† And the Amount of them you declare to be only such as may be expected from a sincere Obedience to any positive Commands of God, “ or are “ in the Nature of the Thing imply'd in “ this *Rite* or result from it.”‡ Which

\* Pag. 151.

† Pag. 153.

‡ Pag. 154.

being

being a very general Account of the Matter, you afterwards a little farther explain it, by saying, that we may expect “all that  
 “Favour of God which is promised and  
 “annex’d to our *assembling* our selves in  
 “Obedience to Him;” and “all those good  
 “Effects which from the NATURAL Tendency of such Performances, may be received in a REASONABLE Way.” But the Expectation of any Benefits peculiar to this Holy Ordinance, under the Notion of *Impressions* or *Communications* from the Holy Spirit of God, for the enabling *Christians* to do their Duty, and to *nourish them unto eternal Life*, is treated by you here and in other Places, with *ridicule*, as a Notion not only groundless, but illusive and Enthusiastical.\* I shall say nothing *here* to this *general Charge*; it will receive a full Answer in the Examination I am next to make of what you have offer’d in the Remainder of your Book, by way of *special* Reply to what has been affirm’d by others concerning the *Benefits* received thro’ a due Participation of these *Holy Mysteries*.

\* Pag. 156, 157.

YOU



You say, they who affirm "that this  
 " *Communion* is the actual partaking of all  
 " the Benefits of Christ's *Body* broken, and  
 " *Bloud* shed, — do not only put *that* upon  
 " one single Act of Religious Obedience,  
 " which — depends upon all Virtues united;  
 " but — has this peculiar Absurdity in it  
 " in this *Rite*, — that it destroys the very  
 " Notion of Remembrance, which is the  
 " Essence of it." \* The former Part of this  
*Paragraph* is answered already, where I shew-  
 ed that what you charge upon your Adver-  
 saries, is a downright Calumny, since the  
*partaking of the Benefits of Christ's Death*, is  
 not put by them upon this single Act of  
 Obedience, but is ascribed to this *Holy Rite*  
 under the absolute indispensable Condition  
 of *Faith* and *Obedience*. Indeed being sen-  
 sible of the Imperfection of our best Obe-  
 dience, and that we are accepted by God  
 merely from the Merits of Christ's Death,  
 they justly look upon *Faith* and *Obedience*,  
 tho' necessary Conditions of Acceptance, yet  
 as void of all Power to reconcile us to  
 God, till they are sanctify'd to that great  
 Purpose, by an Application of the *Benefits*

\* Pag. 158.

of Christ's *Death* in the use of the Means appointed thereunto. Now where is the Absurdity or the *Enthusiasm* of this Supposition? Is not the Importance of *Morality* secured as effectually by this *Scheme*, as by yours? How is this putting Acceptance with God upon one single Act of Obedience? And what is the Difference in this Point, between you and them, but this only, that whilst you *debase* this *Ordinance* to the Condition of one *single* common Act of Obedience, they think it of such Dignity, as to give *Virtue* to all the rest; they look upon it as a Means of conveying to us the *Benefits* of that precious *Death*, thro' which alone we have *Confidence* to appear before God in any Acts of Religion whatsoever; and thro' which alone we have leave to entertain any Hopes at all of *Pardon* and *Salvation*.

As to the *Second* Branch of your Objection founded upon the Notion of the *Benefits* of Christ's Death being *remembered* in the *Lord's Supper*, and therefore not actually conveyed, the Supposition of which you charge as an *Absurdity*; it is time to give

Y

it

it a *particular* Answer, that it may no longer be the Burthen of every Argument. The Benefits purchased by Christ's Death are Pardon of Sin, the continual Assistance of God's Holy Spirit, and Eternal Life. Now if it be supposed, that the Sacraments are the ordinary Means of conveying to *particular* Christians these *general* Benefits; and that *one* Part of the right Performance of the *Duty* of receiving the *Lord's Supper*, does consist in the *Remembrance* of Christ's Death, and of the *Benefits* purchased for Mankind thereby; will the *Commemoration* of the *Benefits* purchased upon the Cross, by that Sacrifice thereon once made, be any Bar to the *particular* Application and Conveyance of that general Promise of *Pardon, Grace,* and *Immortality* which was then obtained? And is there any Absurdity in supposing this? Is it not indeed very natural to suppose, that the *Remembrance* of such *Blessings* obtain'd should be the very means of conveying the same to *particular* Persons? To this you can reply nothing, but that altho' this is not unreasonable to be supposed in *general*, yet that it is so in the *present Case*; because the whole *Essence* of this Rite consists

in

*Remembrance.* But as this is all that can be reply'd, so this is nothing to the Purpose, because this is taking a Point for granted, that is utterly absurd and indefensible. It has been already shewn, that *Remembrance* alone cannot possibly be the *Essence* of this Duty or the *End*, much less the *sole End* of it: Consequently, altho' *Remembrance* is a necessary Part of this Duty, yet it may however be very consistent with an Application of the *Blessings remembered*, to the particular Use and Advantage of those who rightly perform the Duty: How then is this *altering the Nature of this Duty*? The Matter at last depends upon the Grounds there are in *Scripture* for looking upon this *Sacrament* as the means of obtaining the *Benefits* of Christ's Passion, and upon them only. Your Argument from the *Remembrance* is all *Air* and *Fancy*, unless you can demonstrate, what you have so often without Ground asserted, that it is the *Essence* of this *Duty*. And I think I may safely trust that Matter with the *Reader* upon the Force and Credit of what has been already offered to the contrary.

BUT after all, have you not your self *unwarily* given up at last this Argument, so often, even to *tediousness*, repeated? I really think you have. For you affirm, that  
 “ this peculiar *Remembrance* of Him and of  
 “ these *Benefits*, is indeed *one Means* of pro-  
 “ curing them; not indeed you say *at the*  
 “ very Time of the due Performance of  
 “ this *Rite*, but *after* it. Nor by any ne-  
 “ cessary Effect, but by confirming them  
 “ in their Obedience.” \* Now these Re-  
 strictions do not alter the Case, nor secure  
 you against Self-Contradiction. For tho’  
 you have hereby guarded against the Sup-  
 position of any *present*, *necessary* Effect of  
 this *Duty*; yet you still affirm, that ONE  
 MEANS of obtaining these BENEFITS, is  
 the REMEMBRANCE of Christ: Consequent-  
 ly there can be no Inconsistency in the Sup-  
 position of this *Sacrament’s* being AT ONCE a  
 Means of *remembering* the *Benefits* of Christ’s  
 Death, and a Means of *obtaining* them. And  
 so you have at last your self destroy’d the  
 chief Foundation of all your Reasoning up-  
 on this Subject.

\* Pag. 159.



YOU then observe, that “they who affirm this *Sacrament* to be designed and ordained *peculiarly* for the obtaining of God’s *Holy Spirit*, forget and contradict those express Words of our *Saviour*, in which He has himself annex’d that *Benefit* to the Duty of Prayer.” \* The *Passage* of Scripture that contains the Promise of God’s being ready to *give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him* †, determines nothing at all concerning this Point. It makes the Gift of the *Holy Spirit* to depend in some respect upon our Prayers, but says nothing concerning the *Manner* in which it is to be asked. If Prayer, and every other Act of Religion, has its Power with God in virtue of Christ’s *Merits*, and these must be remembered in the *Lord’s Supper*, in order to their being apply’d to us for our Benefit; altho’ it is necessary that by *Prayer and Supplication* we should make our Requests known unto God, yet being intitled to a favourable *Answer*, thro’ the right Performance of this Duty, we can never with so just Confidence hope to be heard, as when we offer our *Prayers* for *this* and every other *Mercy*, in Conjun-

\* Pag. 159.

† Luke 11. 12.

ction with that *Remembrance* of Christ which He hath himself *commanded*. The same may be answered to what you say of Christ's Promise of *of being in the midst of us*; — That "it is not peculiar to our Attendance upon this *Rite*." \* For if at the Beginning, when the mind of our Lord was best known, and most carefully observ'd, there was no Religious *Assembly of Christians*, where this *Rite* was not celebrated; and if the Performance of all *publick Devotions* is imperfect without it, and they are, at whatever Time perform'd, all acceptable only in virtue of that *Sacrifice*, the *Benefits* of which are ordinarily convey'd thro' the use of this *Rite*; the Presence of *Christ* among the Faithful, is then justly, in an especial Manner to be expected, when *they* who are gathered together in his Name, do to their *Prayers* add the appointed *Remembrance* of *Him* and his *Sacrifice* for the Sins of the World.

You say farther to this Effect, that to call this Sacrament "The Food of our *Souls*," is not to give it a Name *peculiarly* proper "to *this*, as distinct from all other Points,

\* Pag. 160.

“ in which we are equally concerned. For  
 “ that the *Word of God*, and *Prayer*, may be  
 “ as well called the *Food of our Souls*, and  
 “ every Thing else which leads to a Life  
 “ of Virtue. “ But you say, there is more  
 “ danger in calling this *Rite* so, because, it  
 “ consisting in eating *Bread* and drinking  
 “ *Wine*, is apt to convey the Notion of  
 “ something MECHANICALLY or miraculously  
 “ conveyed at the same Time into the Soul,  
 “ which is *Food* to that, as the Bread eaten  
 “ is to the Body.”\* That the *Word of God*  
 and *Prayer*, and every Thing else that leads  
 to *Virtue* and promotes *Religion*, may by an  
 easy *Figure* be called the *Food of our Souls*  
 no one denies. But surely this *Appellation*  
 is peculiarly suitable to this *Ordinance*; be-  
 cause it is so much more *eminently* than all  
 other Religious Actions, the means of *Grace*,  
 and the Channel by which God’s *Spiritual*  
*Influences* are convey’d to our Souls. If in-  
 deed the Notion of our receiving Help and  
 Strength from God’s *Holy Spirit* for the en-  
 abling us to exert our Faculties with *Free-*  
*dom* in the exercise of *Religion*, was with-  
 out *Foundation* in *Scripture*, your Caution

\* Pag. 160, 161.

would

would be needful to prevent the Supposition of any such *Supernatural Influence*.

BUT as the Case stands with us in respect of the Depravity of our *natural* Faculties, and of our Subjection to the Devices and Temptations of *Satan*, and after what our Blessed Saviour has declar'd of God's readiness to give his *Holy Spirit* to them that ask Him \*, and what St. Paul has said of the Love of God shed abroad in Men's Hearts by the *Holy Ghost* †, and of our being the Temples of God, a *Holy Habitation* thro' the *Spirit* ‡, and after what is said in numberless other Places, both by our Saviour and his Apostles, concerning the Agency of the *Holy Spirit* not only in the Conversion of a Sinner, but in all his Religious Purposes and Actions; after all this, your Caveat against believing the *Lord's Supper* to be the Food of our Souls in the Sense of conveying to worthy Communicants these *Spiritual Influences*, seems very unseasonable, and affords but too much Ground for a Suspicion that the whole Doctrine of Divine Grace in how strong Terms soever set forth in Scrip-

\* Luke 11. 13. † Rom. 5. 5. ‡ 2 Cor. 6. 16.

ture, is no Part of your *Creed*. For if such *Influences* of God's *Spirit* are necessary for the Preservation of the *Spiritual Life* in the Hearts of *Christians*, the several *Passages* before at large explained, will make it necessary to suppose, that they are chiefly and most *eminently* imparted thro' the use of the *Means* so expressly appointed for that Purpose. And till you are able to shew, that the Church of Christ has all along been under a Mistake in the Belief of a true and real Conveyance of God's *Holy Spirit* in the use of his *Ordinances*, 'twill be to very little Purpose for you to endeavour to explain away what our *Church* has affirm'd in her *Catechism*, that *our Souls are strengthen'd and refreshed by the Body and Bloud of Christ*. You observe, that *Ignatius* calls the Bread broken in the *Eucharist* the Medicine of *Immortality*, our *Antidote* that we should not die, but live for ever in *Christ Jesus* \*. And that *Justin Martyr* calls the *Eucharist*

\* Pag. 162, 163. — ἵνα ἄρτον κλῆντης, ὅς ἐστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντίδοτον τῇ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν, ἀλλὰ ζῆν ἐν ἰησοῦ χριστῷ διαπαντός. *Ignat. Ep. ad Ephes. Cap. 20.*



*by the Name of Food or Nourishment* \*. Now it is to very little Purpose for you to interpret these strong and significant Expressions, as you do, in defiance of the Meaning and plain Design of those that used 'em, unless you had here again shewn this Doctrine of *preventing* and *assisting Grace* to be inconsistent with *Scripture*; and unless you could also have shewn, that the Title to *Immortality* is not ensured to *Christians* thro' the use of this Holy Ordinance.

I HAVE now given *an Answer* to what I think most exceptionable in your *Treatise* from the Beginning to the 164<sup>th</sup> Page. What is farther advanced by you, stands intirely upon the Credit and supposed Truth of your *Scheme*; and your *Scheme* being founded upon the supposed Truth of those Interpretations of *Scripture* which I think I have very plainly prov'd to be false; I might be excused from taking any Notice of what follows to the End. But for the help of such as may need Direction herein, I will still detain you a little longer, whilst

\* Pag. 162. Καὶ ἐπεὶ αὐτὴ καλῶτα παρ' ἡμῶν εὐχεται ——— *Just. Mart. Apol. 1. p. 96.*

I obviate what you have here, in the close of your Work, suggested, against the Importance and beneficial Effects of this *Holy Ordinance*. In order to this, I shall lay before the *Reader*

1. FIRST, the true Scripture Doctrine concerning the *Lord's Supper*, according to the *Interpretations* before given of the several *Passages* that have fallen under *Examination*.

2. SECONDLY, the agreeableness of this Doctrine with Reason, and the Truth and Reality of Things.

3. THIRDLY, the necessity of supposing this to have been the very Doctrine of the *Apostles* concerning this Point, from the universal Practice of the *Church* in *their Days*, and in the *Ages* that *next* followed.

1. Now the true *Scripture-Doctrine* concerning the *Lord's Supper* as it appears from the *Passages* before examined, is this. From the Words of the Institution it appears \*, that since the Lord's Supper was appointed to be performed in a Religious *Remembrance*

\* First Part p. 53.

of the *Passion* of our Lord, who is our God and Saviour, it must be a high Act of *Religious Worship*; and since the plain End and Design of all *Rites of Religious Worship* is for the Good and Advantage of the Worshipers — And moreover since the *Bread* is in the Words of the *Institution* so emphatically called Christ's *Body*, and the *Wine* his *Bloud* — And the Cup is so expressly call'd *the Bloud of the new Covenant* — all *Christians* have just Cause to expect great and *singular Advantages* from so *solemn* an Act of *Religion*, and from a Participation of what is thus describ'd under the most awful Names of *Christ's Body and Bloud*. This general Expectation of *Benefits* ground'd upon the Words of the *Institution*, is confirm'd and heighten'd, and the *Benefits* themselves are in some Sort described by *St. Paul* upon an occasion He took to mention them, in an Argument which He used to dissuade the *Corinthians* from *Idolatry* \*. For it appears from a due Examination of the full Purport of the *Apostle's Reasoning* in that *Passage*, that *the Observation of this Holy Ordinance, is that Communion of Christ's Body and Bloud,*

\* 1 Cor. 10.

where-

whereby Christians hold Intercourse with, and receive Influences from Christ their Head, and are made Partakers as from a Common Stock, of their Proportion of all the Blessings and Expiations purchased by the infinite Merit of his Death and Sufferings. This Interpretation is greatly confirm'd from what the same Apostle has taught us in that Passage of this Epistle, where He reproves some among the Corinthians \* for their unworthiness in the Manner of their receiving the Lord's Supper. For the Care He therein takes to guard this Rite against Profanation, the necessity He shews of a particular solemn Preparation for a due Performance of it, and the great Mischief that He threatens to all those who should be culpable herein, these Things I say, at once shew the Importance of this Duty, above all others, and also afford a solid Ground for believing a worthy Performance of it to be singularly pleasing to God, and that it will at least be rewarded, above all other Duties, with such extraordinary Returns of Blessings, as will fully answer the particular Hazard arising from an undue Manner of performing it. But our Apostle

\* 1 Cor. 11. 20. — 34.

has opened this Point still more plainly, in these words of this *Epistle* — *By one Spirit are we ALL baptized into one Body — And have been ALL made to drink into one Spirit.* \* For I think after what has been above offered in order to clear and settle the true Meaning of that Passage, I may take it for certain, that *the Apostle* is there speaking of *both Sacraments*; and that He affirms them *both* to be the Means of conveying to Christians the Assistance of God's Holy Spirit, and the continual Succours of his Grace. And as if all this was not sufficient, such is the abundance of God's Mercy, that He has been pleased still farther to describe the *Use, End, and Effects* of this Duty, the more effectually to secure us against Error in a Matter of so great Consequence. This is done in our Saviour's *Discourse* in the 6th of St. John, which may serve as a lively *Comment and Illustration* of every Thing else throughout the whole Scriptures which relates to this Subject. For the plain Doctrine of that *Passage* is, that the *eating* Christ's *Flesh* and *drinking* his *Bloud* under the *Symbols* of *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Eucharist*, is

1 Cor. 12. 13.

the



the necessary Means whereby the *Spiritual Life*, and a *Union* with Christ, is preserv'd in all *Christians*; and whereby all Hopes of a *Resurrection* and of *eternal Life* are ensur'd to them.\*

YOU indeed, and some others, will not allow, that our *Saviour* is there speaking at all concerning his *Supper*. Whether what has been before offer'd will prove that He is, must be left to every Man's Judgment. But, if what is said in that *Discourse* be not *directly* to be *interpreted* of the *Holy Eucharist*, yet in the present Question, the Thing will be the same, if it be but truly and properly *applicable* to it. And that it is so, was the undoubted Sense of the generality of the *Reformers*, as it has been of the most eminent of our *Divines* since. Upon the whole therefore the plain *Doctrine* of *Scripture* appears to be this — That the *Lord's Supper* is a *Rite*, thro' a due Performance of which, *Christians* hold *Communion* with *Christ*, and are from time to time admitted to a Share in the *Benefits* procur'd by Him; it being the *Means* appointed for convey-

\* V. 53, 56, 57.

ing to them the *Merit* and *Attonement* of his *Cross* and *Passion*. I am now to shew

2. SECONDLY, the agreeableness of this *Doctrine* with Reason, and the Truth and Reality of Things. It is generally thought, that a multiplicity of *Rites* and *Ceremonies* is a Burthen to *Religion*, and is apt to stifle the true *Power* and *Virtue* of it. Our *Saviour* has therefore freed his *Disciples* from all those troublesome *Rites* and inconvenient *Ceremonies*, of which St. *Peter* complain'd, as a *Yoke* that *neither* the *Jews* of his Time, *nor* their *Fathers* before them, *were able to bear* \*. But then as we are all still *in the Body*, capable of being moved and affected by *sensible Things*, and Subject to strong *Impressions* from them, whilst Care is taken that the *Spiritual Part* of *Religion* should not be oppress'd by the *sensible*, it is very agreeable to the Nature of Man that the highest Acts of *Worship* should be so far attended with *external* and *visible Things* and Actions, as may be useful towards the great Purpose of serving God without *languor* or *Distraction*; and especially, that those

\* *Acts* 15. 10.

Acts of Religion which are enjoin'd for the *Comfort* and the *Encouragement* of its Professors, and for the special Assurance of their holding *Intercourse* with, and receiving Help and Assistance from the *Object* worshipped, should be such Things as are *naturally* capable of affecting us more than Things perfectly *Spiritual* and abstracted from *Sense* could do. This suggests a Reason why, when the costly and burthensome *Sacrifices* of the *Jews* were abolished, by which the *Blessings* of God's *Covenant* were convey'd to them, some *sensible* Means of conveying the *Benefits* of the *Christian Covenant* should be appointed in the room of them; and moreover, that as the *Sacrifices* under the *Law* had their Virtue for the entire *Pardon* and *Peace* of those who *rightly* partook of them, only as they were *Types* and *Representations* of the *Sacrifice* afterwards to be made upon the *Cross*, which alone could *take away Sin*; so there should be some *external ritual* Performance, that might convey to *Christians* the *Benefits* of God's *Covenant* with *them*, establish'd in the *Bloud* of *Christ*. And still farther, that as the *Sacrifices* of the *Jews* were *Emblems* of the *Sacrifice* of the

A a

Cross,

*Cross*; so the Christian Rite, introduced in the Room of them, should be *commemorative* of the same, and should consist in the externally partaking of such *Symbols*, as might aptly represent *that Passion*, the *Merit* of which is the alone Cause of *Attonement*; for which these two weighty and *irresistible Reasons* may be assign'd. — First, that Man might hereby be continually remind-ed of the wretchedness of his *natural* State, and might ever be admonish'd of his real *Depravity*, *Weakness* and *Corruption*, in order to check his native *Pride*, That great Enemy of all *Religion*. And Secondly, that He might be constantly led to look up to the true and only *Author* of his *Redemption* from such Misery; that He might be thereby effectually incited to that Tribute of *Praise* and *Thankfulness* to God and *Christ*, which is a *necessary* and *essential* Part of all acceptable Worship. From these Considerations there appears great Reason, why what is above laid down as the Design and Effect of the *Lord's Supper*, may be esteem'd the *true Doctrine* concerning it. I acknowledge indeed, this would be of little Account if the *Passages* of *Holy Scripture* before examin'd had

not

not first led us to the *Notion*; but when we have already seen that this Doctrine is plainly and naturally deducible from *them*, this *consonancy* of it with Reason and the true State of Things, does not only justify *those Interpretations* of Scripture upon which the *Doctrine* is founded, but confirms and authorizes them also. But this is not all, for

3. THIRDLY, the necessity of supposing this to have been the very *Doctrine* of the *Apostles* appears from the *universal* Practice of the *Church* in their Days, and in the Ages that next follow'd, of making this Rite one constant, chief, and necessary Part of the *Publick Worship* of *Christians* upon the Lord's Day, and at such Times when they were all oblig'd to attend. The Holy *Scriptures*, and all the *Writings* of the first Ages that still remain, and contain any Thing upon this Subject, are so clear in this Point, that I shall easily be excused from the Trouble of proving, what I think neither you, nor any one else deny. But what can be a plainer *Evidence* of the Matter in hand, than this acknowledg'd *Fact*? For why was this the *never omitted* Part of *Publick Worship* at such

A a 2

Times,



Times, if it was not deem'd *necessary* and *essential*? If Repentance and Amendment, if Faith, Prayer, and Thanksgiving were not thought to render the *Service* compleat, without the Addition of the *Remembrance* of Christ in his *Supper*, who will presume to say, that they did not understand the Design of this *Rite* to be, to give Virtue to all other Duties, and to make them acceptable to God by a *Remembrance* of that *Sacrifice*, thro' which all our *best Services* derive their whole Power of pleasing Him? All the Arguments used by your self or others for the Proof of the Perpetuity of this *Rite* thro' all the Ages of the *Church*, do conclude with the same Force for its being design'd for the use of all *Christians* in their constant *Publick Worship*. And as you rightly affirm, that *St. Paul* does "strongly assert our Obligation to shew the Death of Christ in this particular Way, *till his coming again to Judgment*"\*; so I think, it will be very difficult to shew, that the *Apostle's* Direction for the doing this till our Lord's coming to Judgment, can be answered, but by making it a Part of the

\* Pag. 15, 16.

*Publick Worship*, as often as with *convenience* it may be done. Well; and what follows from hence?—this at least; that the *Apostles* themselves look'd upon the Command of our Lord concerning his *Supper*, as a Direction about the Manner of serving God in the Congregations of the Faithful; and consequently that the *Remembrance* of Christ by a Participation of the *Holy Mysteries*, was a necessary Means of *Worship*; and therefore that they who *wilfully* slight and *contemptuously* neglect this *Duty*, are guilty of rejecting the appointed Means of their own Salvation. I say, they who WILFULLY SLIGHT, and CONTEMPTUOUSLY NEGLECT this DUTY. For altho' the Command of our Lord is *peremptory*; yet the Meaning of it, as to the frequency of the Performance thereof, must necessarily admit of the same Latitude that all Commands concerning Acts of *Publick Worship* do. Much is left to the *Discretion* of the Church, and much also to the *private Judgment* of particular *Christians*, as to the frequency of performing them. But when the *Strictness* of the Command, and the *Importance* and *Advantages* of performing it with due frequency, are consider'd, 'tis evident

dent, that it is incumbent upon all *Christians* to be certain, that their omission of the Duty is never the Effect of *Contempt*, or even of *Negligence*. And then there is Reason to believe, that what was anciently said of *Baptism*, is as certainly true of this *Sacrament*, that it looks forward as well as backward, and will be effectual for the Pardon of Sins *afterwards* committed, provided the *Sincerity* of *Repentance* is not wanting, and provided also, that *Necessity* and not *Choice* is the only Cause, why the *appointed Means* for the Conveyance of the *Attonement* of the *Cross*, have not been used.

I SHALL now return to give a short Answer to what may need any in the *Remainder* of your *Performance*. You call it a Mistake in those Persons who style this Duty "the *renewal* of the *new Covenant* on our Part, and the Seal of it on God's Part."\* And you afterwards say †, that "this *Christian Rite* does not appear to you to answer to any *Rites* or *Ceremonies* amongst the *Jews* or *Heathens*, which were properly *federal Rites*." Now since what you

\* Pag. 164.

† Pag. 170, 171.

have

have here advanced upon this Point, for eight or ten Pages together, is in many Things hardly consistent with the *Concessions* made by you in other Places \*; and since the whole is only an Opposition to the use of certain *Terms*, which tho' established by the Authority of the most able Divines, and which well explain the Nature of this *Rite*, yet are not necessary to be used; and since the Cause I am maintaining remains the same, whether these *Terms* are defended or no; and especially since nothing is to be added to what has already been laid before the World by several *learned* Men in their *Answers* to *this Part* of your *Performance*; I shall wholly wave the Consideration of this Matter. But there is still a *Paragraph* or two that must be examined. You affirm to this Effect, that "to say, that  
 " by partaking of the *Lord's Supper* *worthily*,  
 " we secure to our selves God's Favour —  
 " unless by any Viciousness in our Lives  
 " we contradict the Professions of our solemn Devotions, seems no better than to  
 " give to this *Act* a Privilege in *one Part*  
 " of the Sentence which is taken away in

\* Pag. 116, 188, 189.

" the

"the other."† But pray, why may not the *Lord's Supper* be the Means of *reconciling* God to us, and of procuring the necessary Succours of his *Grace*, and of confirming to us the *Title* to eternal Life, and yet these *Privileges* be at last all lost for the want of *Perseverance* to the End? Is there any kind of Absurdity in this Supposition? For altho' they who receive the Sacrament *worthily*, may however at last be deprived of all Reward, thro' their after *Apostasy*; yet is the Virtue of that *Ordinance* the less, because Men forfeit by their *future* Behaviour what they had *once* a right to? What is there said in this Case, that is not represented by the Prophet *Ezekiel* to be said by God himself, concerning a good and righteous Man who afterwards becomes an Apostate?

— If a Man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, — hath walked in my Statutes, and hath kept my Judgments to deal truly, He is just, He SHALL SURELY LIVE, saith the Lord God. — But when the Righteous turneth away from his Righteousness, and committeth Iniquity, — In his Trespass that He

† Pag. 177, 178.



*hath trespassed, and in his Sin that He hath sinned, IN THEM SHALL HE DIE.\**

YOU presently after say, that "it is a  
 " Christian's universal Obedience to the  
 " Will of God which will be his Security,  
 " and not this particular Instance of it,  
 " consider'd by it self."† Now altho' *uni-*  
*versal Obedience* is doubtless every Man's  
*Security*, and consequently what you here  
 call a *particular Instance* of Obedience, mean-  
 ing the partaking of the *Lord's Supper* con-  
 sider'd by it self (that is apart from all other  
 Instances of Obedience) cannot be any *Se-*  
*curity* to any Man; yet it may however be  
 true, and in the present Case it undoubt-  
 edly is so, that *this particular Instance of O-*  
*bedience*, as you call it, may be necessary to  
 the making *all other Instances* of it *acceptable*,  
 and consequently that what is here said by  
 you is quite foreign to the Purpose. But  
 you say farther, that this " Duty is but  
 " ONE, and that being but ONE, when  
 " accompany'd with the Performance of all  
 " others, it is not to this *single Instance* of  
 " *Christian Duty* (any more than to ANY

\* *Ezech.* 18. 5, 9, 14.

† *Pag.* 178, 179.

“ OTHER) that a Christian owes the Security of his Acceptance with God ”\* — Now admitting your Supposition — That this Duty is but ONE, (which is however supposed without ground) yet how will it follow from hence, that *Christians* owe the *Security* of their *Acceptance* with God no more to *this* Duty than to *any* other? Sure you have quite forgotten what you laid down at the beginning for the Foundation of your whole *Scheme*. You then rightly affirm’d, that “the partaking of the Lord’s “ *Supper is not a Duty of it self, but made “ such by the Institution of Jesus Christ*”† — And that the “ *Design and End of it depends “ intirely upon his Will and Declaration*”‡ —

Now if this is the Case, there results from it such a wide Difference between the *Nature* of *this* Duty and of every *other* Duty, which you call a *Duty of it self*, or a *moral* Duty, that there can be no arguing from *one* to the *other*, to shew the *Comparative Importance* of either. For as the *Importance* of *moral* Duties is to be rated from their conduciveness to the *moral* or

\* Pag. 177.

† Prop. I.

‡ Prop. II.

natural *good* that is served by the Performance of them; so the *Importance* of *this* and all other *positive Duties*, must be estimated, from the *End*, *Use*, and beneficial *Effects* of them which the *Institutor* himself, and they who perfectly knew his Mind, have ascrib'd unto them. This Reasoning is as true, as your *Propositions*, and is founded upon them. So that when you here argue, that a *Christian* does not owe the *Security* of his *Acceptance* with God to *this single Instance* of *Christian Duty* any more than to any other, because it is supposed to be *but one*, the Argument is *fallacious*; because tho' it be allow'd to be *but one*, yet being of a different *Species* from all *moral Duties*, and deriving its *Weight* and *Importance* from quite another Cause, you can know nothing of its *real Worth* and *Use*, by comparing it with any of the *moral Duties*, but only by having recourse to what the *Institutor* has declar'd concerning it. And if upon that Inquiry it should appear to have been made the necessary Means of *Acceptance* with God, and an *essential* Part of *Christian Worship*, it must from thence follow, that a *Christian* owes his *Security* of *Acceptance* to this *sin-*

gle Instance of Obedience, *much more* than He can to *any other*, since every *other* Act of Obedience is supposed to be even *sanctify'd* and made *acceptable* by *this*. The whole Matter therefore must rest at last upon the *Declarations* that have been made in Scripture concerning the *End* and *Effect* of this *Duty*, and your *Inference* from its being supposed to be a SINGLE Duty, quite falls to the Ground.

I HAVE now finish'd my design'd Answer to your *Treatise* upon the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, but having in the beginning made a Charge against you concerning the *Prayers* annex'd to your *Treatise*, I ought before I conclude, either to support and justify *that Charge*, or to retract it. I have frequently since that Time, reviewed and considered your *Prayers*, and if I could see any Cause to alter the Opinion I at first had of them, I would now very readily retract the *Charge*, and ask Pardon for having made it. But upon the most serious and repeated Examination of them, I must still declare, I think them *not fit for the use*  
of

of any Christian whatsoever \*, and that for the Reasons at first mention'd.

I WAS going on with my Design of making good this *Charge* against you, but finding it proper to say more upon the Subject than can with Convenience be printed at this Time, I shall throw what I have to offer into an *Appendix*, which I propose, with God's leave, to publish with all Speed, that I may thereby satisfy the *Engagement* I am under to *You* and the *Publick*.

\* Part I. pag. 3.





( 172 )

ADVERTISEMENT.

There is now in the Press, and will speedily be publish'd, *An APPENDIX to the ANSWER to the Plain Account &c.* containing Observations upon the *Prayers* of the Author of the *Plain Account &c.* thereunto annex'd, in order to shew the *unfitness* of the same for the use of *Christians*.

By RICHARD WARREN D.D.

There is also in the Press, and will speedily be publish'd, a Second Edition of Part II. of the said ANSWER to the *Plain Account &c.*

18 JA 53

17

nd  
P-  
the  
b-  
he  
xc.  
ew  
use

nd  
nd  
N-